AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—MAY, 1893.—NO. 5.

THE SWEETEST SONG OF EARTH.

A VENERABLE tradition, founded on the Proto-evangel of St. James, pictures our Blessed Lady as spinning when the Angel addressed her in the words of the "Ave Maria." The Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, we are told, had decided that a new veil was to be made for the Temple, and seven undefiled virgins of the tribe of David had been selected for the task. They cast lots before the high priest, who of them should spin the golden thread, who the blue, who the scarlet, who the fine linen, and who "the true purple." The modesty of Mary who had just finished her novitiate of eleven years in the Temple school at Jerusalem, might have prevented her from taking part in the task, but Zachary, the high priest of that year, who knew her well, had called her, and when "the true purple" fell to her lot to spin she went away to her own house. When she had wrought her portion, she carried it to the high priest, "and the high priest blessed her saying *Mary the Lord has magnified thy name, and thou shalt be blessed in all the ages of the world. Then Mary, filled with joy, went away to her cousin Elizabeth.*"[1]

The story, so far as it agrees with the Gospel of St. Luke, gives us a key to the conduct and state of mind of our Blessed Lady while on that journey of which we read after the annunciation. "Mary rising up in those days went into the mountainous country with haste, into a city of Juda,

1 Proto-Evangelion St. Jacob. min. chap. ix.

and,"[1] says St. Luke, "she entered into the house of Zachary, and saluted Elizabeth." Then follow the words which millions of devout Catholic hearts and lips repeat day by day, thus verifying the prophecy that is contained in the most charming of Messianic canticles the "Magnificat," in which Mary announced to Elizabeth, "henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

There is so little said, in the Gospels, about our blessed Lady, and her own words are so few, that we may well treasure up and repeat to ourselves the sweet sounds of her voice and above all others that lovely burst of song which echoed from the portals of Zachary's house at Hebron to be caught up by all the blessed mountain-sides of earth in never-equaled harmony unto the end of time.

The Angel spoke to Mary at Nazareth. The home of Zachary, whither she hastened, lay more than a hundred miles to the south. Her journey could hardly be accomplished in less than a week, although we need not suppose that it was made entirely, or even in greater part, on foot. The modest maiden, who had barely completed her fourteenth year, might join one of the caravans which must have been frequent at this time of the year, for it was near to the Passover, when travel was timely and the roads were favorable, not only those which lead from Galilee along the Jordan to Jerusalem, but those midway through the mountain chains that barred Samaria on either side, and which were rarely trodden by the righteous Pharisee. Khans for the wayfarer, which a religious custom long ere David had founded, were abundant through the entire range of Palestine, and the sacred laws of hospitality among the Jews shielded every stranger or even beggar in such a way as to accord him right of entrance for shelter and food. Thus the retiring virgin might travel unmolested, nay sure of that exceptional religious respect which was due to her maidenhood and character as stranger.

It was the season of the "latter rains" corresponding to our spring, for we may safely assume that Zachary's week in

[1] St. Luke i, 39.

the Temple when the Angel appeared to him, six months before, fell in the time of the autumn service. Whether Mary followed the road that passes down the ravines between Samaria and Galilee, through the fertile meadows of Bethsan, and along the Jordan valley to Jericho, or whether she followed the route through the plain of Esdraelon, passing over the hills of Samaria and Sichem to the Holy City, and thence by Bethlehem to the home of her cousin, we are sure that the scenes which greeted her were equally cheerful and inspiring. South of Jerusalem, especially, the country was most beautiful. The Jewish fancy had located Paradise in the very town of Hebron, from whose red soil the first man is said to have been created. These valleys would, at such a time be, to use the words of a modern traveler,[1] "ablaze with bright colors; shrubs, grass, gay weeds, and wild flowers, over all the uplands and thickets, of varied blossom, sprinkled with sheets of white briar roses, in the hollows; beautiful cyclamen peeping from under the gnarled roots of great trees and from amidst the roadside stones." Here "in a cradle of hills, three thousand feet above the neighboring Mediterranean, lay the home of Zacharias."

Can we surmise what thoughts and feelings were uppermost in the mind and heart of Mary on her journey hither? "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh"[2] and the exultant tones of her speech issuing forth in the sublime chant of the "Magnificat" reveal to us the thoughts which seem like a crystalized gem of ecstatic prophecy wrought within the Immaculate Heart of Mary during the days and nights which she spent on the way.

The four metrical strophes of the "Magnificat" contain two leading thoughts and two prophecies. The first is, if we may so call it, personal. Mary contemplates herself; but the result as well as the cause of that contemplation is the recognition of her humility, hence her exaltation is in reality a merging of herself into the wondrous magnificence of Jehovah. The prophecy bound up with this thought is that

1 Geikie, Life of Christ, chap. vii.
2 St. Luke vi, 45.

of her future title as being called "blessed" by all generations. In the second part Mary dilates upon the graces that are to flow down upon the human race to the end of ages in the announcement of the Messiah; and in this she predicts the accomplishment of the blessing foretold "to our fathers, to Abraham and his seed." How natural this reference to the patriarchs of the Jewish race, for she stood at that moment upon the very ground which sheltered their ashes. She, the fairest daughter of the royal Prophet, was repeating before Elizabeth snatches of the same sweet strains which David loved to sing a thousand years before, for Hebron had been the home of King David for more than seven years, nay here he had been anointed by Samuel—Samuel? Yes. What sweet associations the very name called forth! Had Mary been thinking of him on the journey? of him and of that model of Christian mothers, Anne, who long ago had journeyed the same way from Ephraim as far as Silo the city where Heli dwelt by the side of the Temple. The year before she had wept there and prayed, because of her barrenness, which excluded her from the blessing coveted by every devout Hebrew woman, that is to say the hope of being the mother of the Messiah. And the high priest had said to her: "Go in peace and the God of Israel grant thee thy petition which thou hast asked of him."[1] But now she came with the sweet child which "was yet very young" and she offered the same to Heli saying: "For this child did I pray, and the Lord has granted me my petition which I asked of him." And with the words she surrendered to the service of the Temple the future guardian of the Ark of the Covenant. And then turning in gratitude to the Holy of Holies she poured forth a prayer called the canticle of Anna, so wondrously like, in sentiment and melody to the "Magnificat," that we cannot withold from ourselves the conclusion that Mary must have had the words in her mind and fashioned her own grateful joy in the mould of the Hebrew song which every young mother had reason to treasure as a sacred bequest. Let us place side by side the outpourings of

1 I Kings i, 17.

two hearts steeped, so to speak, in an atmosphere of grace, and familiar with the devotional expression of the Hebrew ritual, so that the sacred words would leap with equal ease to the lips of the young Virgin-mother, trained heretofore in the Temple-school, and to the matron who had year after year prayed at the mercy seat for a fruit of her womb.

Canticle of Mary.

(S. Luke, i, 46–55.)

My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Because he hath regarded the humility of his handmaid: for, behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

For he that is mighty hath done great things to me: *and holy is his name.* And his mercy is from generation to generation, to them that fear him.

He hath showed might in his arm: he hath scattered the proud in the conceit of their heart. He hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble.

He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent away empty.

Canticle of Anna.

(I Kings, ii, 1–10.)

My heart has rejoiced in the Lord, and my horn (spirit of strength) is exalted in my God: my mouth is enlarged over my enemies, *because I have joyed in thy salvation.*

There is none holy as the Lord is, for there is no other beside thee, *and there is none strong like our God.*

Do not multiply to speak lofty things, boasting; let old matters depart from your mouth: for the Lord is a God of all knowledge, and to him are thoughts prepared.

The bow of the mighty is overcome, and the weak are girt with strength.

They that were full before have hired out themselves for bread, and the hungry are filled so that the barren hath borne many, and she that had many children is weakened.

The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to hell, and bringeth back again.

The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich; he humbleth and he exalteth.

He raiseth up the needy from the dust, and lifteth up the poor from the dunghill, that he may sit with princes, and hold the throne of glory. For the poles of the earth are the Lord's, and upon them he hath set the world.

He hath received Israel his servant, being mindful of his mercy. As he spoke to our fathers, to Abraham *and to his seed forever.*

He will keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness, because no man shall prevail by his own strength.

The adversaries of the Lord shall fear him, and upon them shall he thunder in the heavens. The Lord judges the ends of the earth; and he *shall give empire to his King, and shall exalt the horn of his Christ.*

Surely the parallelism of thought and feeling as expressed in these two canticles is striking, although the words in either case are but the expressions of the Hebrew psalter. Hence we may fairly suppose that our blessed Lady actually sang the Magnificat in the Hebrew tongue even though this was not the ordinary language of her home and surroundings. Nor is there anything repugnant in the idea of its having been actually uttered in song. Song is the spontaneous expression of joy or any kindred emotion among the Oriental nations, and the familiarity with the hymns of the Jewish Temple service and the sentiments of the sacred Law may readily have given to the prophetic impulse that holy manifestation which was its most fitting because sacred form. It is easy for us to realize this when we recall how the melodies of the *Exultet*, the *Te Deum*, the *Pater Noster*, or the *Gratias agamus Domino Deo Nostro* impress us more when chanted in the Latin tongue than in the language which we habitually use, perhaps because the occasions on which we ordinarily hear these prayers give to them a certain solemnity of character which the vernacular could not do. *Symphonialis est anima*, says the learned Thomassin, and in its highest flights the soul seeks rythmic expression and the accompaniment of chords which speak of harmony and peace. Such is the melodious charm of the "Magnificat" in its very sentiment and apart from all musical translation. It expresses neither altogether joy nor altogether gratitude, but a union of all that love utters in its sublimest exaltation. Hence "the Virgin's Song" is never omitted in the Office

throughout the liturgical year; even at the saddest seasons when nothing but the sounds of mourning and penance are heard in the temple of God, we chant the solemn cadences of the "Magnificat"; and at Vespers the priest ascends the altar to accompany the singing of Mary's canticle by the swingings of the burning thurible, as though the sweetest of hymns were to be wafted heavenward amid the fragrant clouds of frankincense. Fair melody of the "Magnificat," what consolation has it not brought to the Catholic heart ever since it was first sung in the City where Sarah and Rebecca and Lia lie beside the patriarchs and where Samuel placed the "Stone of Help" saying "Thus far the Lord hath helped us!" So will it ever be to the end of all time whilst the mercy of the Lord endureth who "hath regarded the humility of his handmaid."

P. ARMINIO.

A PRETENDED VICIOUS CIRCLE.

THE vicious circle is a sophistical argument in which the truth of one proposition is made to depend exclusively from the truth of a second proposition, which is itself made to turn on the first proposition and depend exclusively from it. Catholics are accused of using this sophistical argument in proving the authority of the Church from the Scripture as an inspired document which is proved to be inspired by the authority of the Church. We are charged with saying: The Church has authority because the Gospels and Epistles, which are inspired, say so: the Gospels and Epistles are inspired because the Church says so.

Let us first take some examples from elsewhere, which will prepare the way for exposing the fallacy concealed in this objection to the Catholic argument.

A man comes to Washington and reports himself to the Government as the English ambassador, presenting his credentials. Some one might say: the man may be an impostor, who has forged or stolen his papers. What is the proof that he is the ambassador? The credentials. What

is the proof that the credentials are genuine, and that he is the person named in them? He says so.

Now, it is plain that the present ambassador was at once received by the President, on presenting his credentials. Did he move in a vicious circle? Evidently not. The ambassador was received when he presented himself, as being the person he proposed himself to be, without any previous court of inquiry. His credentials were at once accepted without any formal investigation of their genuineness. He said he was the English minister, and his word was believed. He said: These papers are my credentials; and they were received, and their attestation of his official character was accepted as authentic. Why was this reasonable, and the mutual testimony of this gentleman and his credentials to each other credible?

Evidently, because of many circumstances and reasons making it certain that no impostor could succeed in palming himself off as an English minister, or palming off forged or stolen papers. Therefore when the minister presents himself, saying that he has been sent by the Queen of England, his word is credible. If he be really the minister, he must say so. His saying so is a necessary point of the evidence that he is so. Moreover, his credentials must accredit him. In a word, the circumstances of the case make the mutual testimony of the minister and his credentials credible and trustworthy. Whenever he brings a letter, or makes a verbal statement of instructions from the English Cabinet to the Secretary of State, it will be received as authentic on his sole authority.

To take another instance. Suppose an infidel objects to a believer in divine Revelation. You say that such and such doctrines are true because God has revealed them, who is truth itself. You say that God is truth, because He has declared it in His revelation. That is, you affirm the veracity of God on the ground of a supposed revelation of His veracity, whereas the credibility of this very revelation of His veracity depends on His veracity. Moreover, you say that God has revealed these doctrines because He says in the

revelation itself that He reveals them, and you assert that He says this, because the declaration to that effect is a true revelation from God.

Here is a patent instance of the fallacy of *idem per idem*, a perfect circle which is perfectly vicious. Of course, no advocate of divine Revelation would be guilty of such manifest sophistry, and I would not impute to any respectable infidel such a gross misrepresentation of the Christian argument. But it is a good illustration of the similar, though more concealed artifice which I am intending to expose.

Of course, every tyro knows, that the existence of God is first known by reason, and that it is contained in the very idea of God, that He is the Truth itself, in being, in knowing, and in manifesting Himself. It is therefore metaphysically certain, that if He reveals certain doctrines, they must be true, and have a claim on our absolute assent. If He makes a revelation to man He must give him evidence of the fact. What St. Ambrose says is applicable to God, as well as to man. "*Morale est omnibus, ut qui fidem exigunt, fidem astruant.*" The Christian Revelation is received as divine on account of the motives of credibility. We have, therefore, a perfect, logical syllogism. Whatever God reveals is true; He has revealed certain doctrines; therefore, these doctrines are true.

When God speaks to man, He must, explicitly or implicitly, declare that it is He who is speaking, that He is the living God, Creator and Lord of the world, that He is true, that He is good, that He is faithful to His promises. He is already known to be veracious, and when He affirms His own being, truth, goodness, reason demands that His word should be believed. Moreover, divine Grace illuminates the intellect and inspires the will, so that the mind is elevated and strengthened in such a way that it can elicit acts of supernatural faith, and by a spiritual intuition recognize the voice of God, speaking His divine words. I believe in God as He is revealed in the Bible, because it is the word of God. This is rational because there is an underlying certainty of the existence and veracity of God, and that He is the author

of the Bible; and it is from this firm and reasonable ground that faith can safely take its flight to a higher contemplation of God and His divine truths.

The same instance may be presented and considered under another form.

Suppose one were to say: Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and therefore what He says is true and to be believed. He says that He is the Son of God, and therefore one must believe, on His word that He is so. Plainly, this is a vicious circle, if the second proposition is exclusively dependent from the first, which itself is exclusively dependent from the second. Not if the first proposition is proved *aliunde*.

Jesus Christ declared Himself to be the Son of God, and gave conclusive evidence that He was so. The prophecies, the register of His birth, the testimony of John the Baptist, the adoration of the Magi, His moral sanctity, the sublimity of His doctrine, His miracles, His raising of the dead, His own resurrection and ascension, proved that God was in Him; and that therefore His testimony to His own divine sonship and true divinity was credible. His own word is a sufficient guarantee of the truth of whatever revelation He makes concerning Himself, the Father, the Holy Spirit, or any topic whatever. It is perfectly rational to say: Jesus Christ says that He is the Son of God, therefore, He is; when this proposition is placed in its due relations. It is the highest act of reason to believe His word, and the most supreme folly to disbelieve or even to doubt it.

We come now to the case in hand, the pretended vicious circle in the argument by which the Scripture and the Church are made to give mutual testimony to each other. The way in which it is put in the form of a vicious circle is this. Certain writings are inspired Scripture, because the Church by her infallible authority has decreed that they are. The Church has infallible authority, because the inspired Scripture says that she has. In this statement it is implied that the authority of the Church is affirmed, solely on account of certain texts of inspired Scripture, and the inspiration of Scripture solely on account of the decision of the

Church. The whole is a miserable sophism, so often exposed, that it is a shame for any one to repeat it.

The authority of the Church, when proved from texts of the New Testament, is proved from these texts as contained in documents which are genuine, authentic writings of the apostolic age, and have historical authority. The authority of inspiration does not enter into the argument. That Christ and the Apostles established the Church as the authoritative teacher of Christianity is a historical fact, attested by these apostolic writings. In the exercise of this authority, the Church defines the inspiration of the Scriptures and determines the canon. The inspiration of the books of the New Testament being thus made certain, has a reduplicative effect upon the argument for the authority of the Church derived from their historical trustworthiness. Their human testimony becomes divine testimony. The Bible and the Church being both from God must bear testimony to each other. The fact that they do so, is a mark and an evidence of their common divine origin and authority. It is the same case as the instance of the ambassador and his credentials. The argument from the New Testament, as a genuine, authentic record of the acts and doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, for the authority of the Church, and from the authority of the Church to the inspiration of the New Testament is perfectly logical. It is also conclusive and sufficient. Nevertheless, it is not, by any means, the complete and comprehensive sum of the evidence, either for the divine authority of the Church, or the divine authority of the Scriptures, as the inspired word of God.

The Catholic Church does not depend solely on a few texts of the New Testament, as the credentials of her divine mission. She proves herself, by existing and standing in the world through the ages, one, holy, Catholic and apostolic; like a great ancient nation, a city, or a pyramid. She is historical Christianity, apostolic doctrine and order, embodied in organic life, vivified by the Spirit sent by her Founder and Ruler. She is a continuous witness to her origin in the apostolic college, to Pentecost and the Coenaculum, to the

resurrection, crucifixion and life of Jesus Christ. Her ancient records and the facts of her history in the fourth, third, second and first centuries attest the tradition of the Christian Faith and Law in its genuine purity to her episcopate from the Apostles who received them immediately from the divine Teacher and Lawgiver. She is His greatest and most miraculous work, after the Incarnation and Resurrection. As the world bears witness to its Creator, the Church bears witness to its Founder. As Christ's assertion of His divinity is credible, because He showed Himself to be one with the Father, and filled with the Spirit, by His character and works; the Catholic Church is credible when she declares her divine mission and infallible authority. The Gospels and Epistles are not isolated documents, coming down to us from an unknown past without a commentary; but they come surrounded by an environment and accompanied by records graven in monuments as well as written on parchment, which present irrefragable evidence to the nature of the religion which the Lord commissioned His Apostles to promulgate. We know what He meant by the Rock and the Church built upon it, because we see both plainly before our eyes, from the year 30 to the year 1893, and the gates of hell vainly warring against them.

In respect to the inspiration of the Scriptures, it is true that we receive the canonical books of both Testaments as inspired, on the authority of the Church. But if this proposition is taken in the restricted sense that our only motive of faith in them is the formal definition of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, it is erroneous. The precise act of dogmatic authority which the Church exercised in the Tridentine Council, was to define inspiration, and to determine the canon, especially in respect to a few books, in regard to which some doubts had been entertained in the early centuries, and were not entirely dissipated. The Council of the Vatican repeated the definition of the canon, and made the definition of inspiration more explicit. In these definitions the Church has concentrated and formulated the doctrine which had been held always, everywhere, and by all, respecting the inspi-

ration of the Holy Scriptures. This doctrine was received as an heir-loom from the Jewish Church. All the proto-canonical books of the Old Testament were in the Hebrew canon, since the time of Esdras, and the deutero-canonical books, also, were in the Alexandrian canon, were included in the Septuagint version, and all alike were generally received in the Christian Church. There were local, individual and temporary doubts about a few books in the Old Testament, and also about a few of the New. There was, however, very early an universal agreement in respect to all books of the New Testament, and in the course of time, the same agreement in respect to all books included in the Tridentine Canon. The mind of the Church was manifested by her ordinary teaching, and this was made more explicitly and certainly evident by the formal conciliar decrees.

Notwithstanding doubts about a few books, the inspiration and divine authority of all parts of the duly attested Sacred Scripture was never questioned by Jews or Christians. The authority of the Church is that of a witness as well as that of a judge. The authority which gives us assurance of the inspiration of the Bible keeps and guards an ancient and universal tradition and belief, descending from Moses and the prophets to Christ and the Apostles and through all the following ages to the present time. Scripture, traditions, and ecclesiastical authority are inseparable constituents of one divine Revelation, having the same source, and conspiring together into unity. This triple cord cannot be broken and therefore sophists try to untwist its strands. The futility of their efforts show how weak and indefensible is every cause that is in opposition to Catholic truth, which is a perfect sphere having in it no flaw.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

THE PRIEST AS BOOK CENSOR.

A great novel is a gift of God; but the average novel is generally a gift of the devil.—*Dr. Maurice F. Egan.*

You cannot detect its [the pessimistic novel's] subtile influence until it has left the iron in your soul, and the sweet prayers of your childhood have grown insipid, and the ritual and ceremonies of the church have lost their attraction, and you no longer think of God and your future with the same concern. It is in steering clear of such novels that direction is especially necessary.—*Brother Azarias.*

IS it a sin to read novels, Father? Few priests among those who have had even a limited experience in the confessional need be reminded that the foregoing question is one frequently propounded; and still fewer, it is to be hoped, are content to give to it so summary a solution as that comprised in the off-hand answer: yes, or no. In fact, to the question thus badly put, the response cannot well be monosyllabic without being at the same time vastly imprudent.

To tell the young woman or girl (from whom the query usually comes) merely that the reading of novels is not wrong, is constructively to sanction her perusal of many books whose tendency, though skilfully disguised or veiled, is in reality not less vile and pernicious than that of the worst volumes to be found on the Church's prohibitory *index:* while to answer summarily that novel-reading *is* sinful, is to go to the other extreme and to display a rigorism as indefensible as would be the condemnation of basking in the sunlight or inhaling the spring-time odors. In the meanwhile, the mere fact that the question is not an infrequent one, indicates with sufficient clearness that one of the multifarious aspects under which the priest is regarded by those entrusted to his charge, is that of book censor. And as book censor, capable or incompetent, safe or unreliable, according to the measure of his attainments and the depths of his conscientiousness, every priest engaged in the active ministry must in one way or other certainly act.

To acquit himself of the duties of this office with even comparative credit and success, it seems essential that the

priest of our day should acquire an extensive, though not necessarily a first-hand, acquaintance with fiction. True, the domain of knowledge is become so widened that even the most gifted minds must perforce admit their ignorance in many a field of thought, and possibly there is no department of literature of which, from a personal standpoint, a priest can better afford to be ignorant than contemporary fiction; yet for others' sake, if not his own, it behooves him to attain such information on the subject as will enable him to guide with prudence, to condemn or approve with intelligence and discrimination. The world of to-day is a reading world; but for one hour devoted to the perusal of historical, scientific, biographical, or devotional works, at least five are given up to the devouring of newspapers and novels. The statistics of public and private libraries, the testimony of booksellers and publishers, observation of the volumes one sees in the hands of fellow-travelers on railway or steamship, a casual examination of the literature prevalent in the ordinary home circle—all emphasize the fact that, of three-fourths of those who read at all, the *vade mecum* is the fictitious narrative, the omnipresent novel.

Pre-eminently the literary expression of this closing quarter of the nineteenth century, the novel is stamped with the characteristics of the times; and just as, with not a little that is noble, the age presents much that is common-place and a great deal that is base, so among novels there are to be found the positively good, the comparatively harmless, and the superlatively vicious. To be able to discriminate among these various classes and the multiplied divisions of which each is susceptible, to be so skilled in literary botany as to distinguish not only the healthful plant from the deadly herb, but the innocent odor of one beauteous flower from the poisonous perfume of a blossom which, to unschooled gatherers, is equally fair and sweet, is to possess a knowledge of no little value to him who as father-confessor, director of the parish library, or friendly counsellor and guide, must often be consulted as to the selection of books.

How is this knowledge to be acquired? Assuredly not by

the priest's personally examining the monthly or weekly output of the various factories of fiction. Such a course would be condemnable, even in the hypothetical case of its being practicable; and practicable it is not, save in a very limited degree. So mighty is the flood of light literature with which American and English publishing houses are deluging the country that even were one to devote his time to nothing else, he could not give the most cursory examination, the merest skimming, to one-tenth of the volumes that bid for public favor. Shall the pronouncements of the critical reviews be accepted as a standard sufficiently safe? As to the artistic merits or defects of the novel discussed, the judgments of such reviews may be entitled to some consideration; but as to the practical question whether the novel may be read by a Catholic, and especially a young Catholic, with some profit or at least without fear of injury, they are generally worthless, if not misleading. The briefer notices given in the ordinary secular magazines and in the more important among the secular papers are equally unsatisfactory. Some of the most dangerous books in recent fiction, books which sap the very foundations of the theological virtues, have been lauded by such censors as genuine additions to the literature of all time, priceless gifts of genius-dowered mortals to a world which in justice should hold their names in perpetual benediction. Lists, like Sir John Lubbock's, of the best hundred books, however valuable as helps in determining a course of general reading, will manifestly prove of very meagre usefulness in aiding us to separate the scanty wheat from the superabundant chaff in the perennial harvest of novels.

Where, then, or from whom shall we acquire that second-hand knowledge which, as regards the great bulk of English fiction, is the only kind of information that we may reasonably hope to attain? Who shall tell us whether this or that novel is good or bad, elevating or enervating, Christian or agnostic, pure or prurient, nobly suggestive or utterly silly, a wholesome refreshment or a poisonous drug? Surely none other than Catholic critics who, with ability to discuss in-

telligently literary worth and worthlessness, have moreover, the Catholic instinct that discerns the immoral under specious appearances, and who fearlessly denounce even the most fashionable work or popular author when the interests of religion, truth, and decency demand the denunciation. Such prudent guides through the territory of fiction are the book reviewers of our Catholic magazines—notably *The Month*, the *Ave Maria* and *The Catholic World*—and those of the better edited among our Catholic papers. And here it seems fitting to add that one function of the literary censor, of which no pastor who is not inexcusably negligent of the spiritual interests of his flock will fail to acquit himself, is the propagation among his parishioners of the religious family magazines and the Catholic journal. As an antidote to the noxious vapors exhaling from the daily and weekly secular press, such a magazine or paper is little short of a necessity in every Catholic household; while its importance as an agent co-operating with the priest in the inculcation of religious truth and the promotion of genuine morality cannot easily be overestimated.

Of the Catholic handbooks treating of the healthy and unwholesome in modern fiction, we have all too few; but much that is helpful will be found in Brother Azarias' lecture on "Books and Reading" and Maurice Francis Egan's "Novels and Novelists." The extensive reading, broad culture, accurate taste, and philosophical grasp of mind which distinguish the scholarly Christian Brother make him an especially efficient mentor; and one's only regret in perusing his admirable booklet is that he has not given us more copious outpouring of his intellectual wealth. In the meantime, since people will read fiction, it is reassuring to have his authority for the statement that "there is no dearth of novels that have passed the ordeal of time and are pronounced classic."

Dr. Egan's volume, as its title indicates, is more directly in line with the subject of this paper, and can be unreservedly commended to those for whom we write, priests who would acquire, at second-hand, some notion of what is

good and otherwise among the novels in our language. It will increase, rather than diminish, the gratification of those who consult this interesting book of criticism to learn that the hundred and odd reviews and notices which it contains were not written "for very young people;" that Dr. Egan was actuated by the belief "that the time has arrived when Catholic American literature should begin to look beyond a narrow space walled by premium-books filled with goody-goody stories which no clever young person dreams of reading;" and that "he desires to do something toward supplying a standard of judgment, moral and literary, which may be of use to those who run and read, and consequently suffer from that mental dyspepsia following the attempted assimilation of unwholesome and undigested food."

Concerning this moral standard which, from the priestly censor's point of view, is of course the paramount one, it may be said that very few, if any, of even the greatest non-Catholic novelists are unobjectionable. The Wizard of the North, whom Wilkie Collins—he of the involuted and convoluted, the complicated and entangled and seemingly unravelable plots—enthusiastically styles "the glorious Walter Scott, King, Emperor, and President of novelists," has occasional pages sullied with misrepresentations of monks and nuns, and with travesties of Catholic ceremonies; Thackeray, whose transparent mask of cynicism cannot hide the genuine love of his fellows that swelled his manly heart, is sometimes too outspoken to suit a cultured taste; and Dickens is not always free from coarseness and vulgarity: yet in the worst of any of these morality is never descried, virtue never sneered at, nor vice palliated if not insidiously taught. To their books is not applicable, as it assuredly is applicable to nine-tenths of the novels of to-day, Carlisle's criticism of the works of one of their confraternity: "They are not profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for edification, for building up or elevating in any shape; the sick heart will find no beating in them, the heroic that is in all men no divine awakening voice." Catholics old enough to be trusted with even the cleanest of our great

daily newspapers need fear no contamination from the pages of "Ivanhoe," "Waverly," "Kenilworth," and "The Heart of Midlothian;" or of "The Newcomes," "Pendennis," "Henry Esmond," and "Vanity Fair;" or of "Nicholas Nickleby," "David Copperfield," "Bleak House," and "Barnaby Rudge."[1]

George Eliot's later works and Bulwer-Lytton's earlier ones cannot be recommended, but "Adam Bede," "The Mill on the Floss," and "Silas Marner" may be read with safety, as may "My Novel," "The Caxtons," "The last days of Pompeii," and "Rienzi." To mention only a few of the *dii minores:* Anthony Trollope's score and a half of volumes possess the negative merit of humdrum innoxiousness, a merit not always shared by that other prolific English writer G. P. R. James. William Black's "A Daughter of Heth" and "A Princess of Thule" are charming tales; and Blackmore's "Lorna Doone," like Wallace's "Ben Hur," is one of the few really great fictitious works in the language. Wilkie Collins' "Little Novels" is better than most of his bigger ones. George Ebers and Walter Besant are humanitarians whose books may very properly be treated with the neglect which they show to God. George Meredith, the Browning of the novelists, is a strong writer whose style will delight the scholar more than his matter will benefit the ordinary reader. Rider Haggard's seriousness, degenerating occasionally into sensuality, makes his romances unhealthy food for

1 Scott's claim on the gratitude of Catholics was in 1891 discussed thus favorably by the *Dublin Review:* "He changed the *animus* against all things Catholic into a romantic interest in our faith, and threw a halo around our doctrines, devotions, and customs . . . If the disposition to admire the days of chivalry and state of society in which the Church was paramount misted, then Scott's writings shed a bright and engaging coloring over those centuries; if he created a love and veneration for the religious aspect of mediævalism, then to him we owe the happy results which have followed the exaltation of the Catholic Church as the ideal of so many of our countrymen. In either case, Catholics may well be grateful to Sir Walter Scott."

Thackeray's opinion of Catholicism may be conjectured from his remark on a Catholic Cathedral: "After all, that is the only thing that can be called a church."

any mind, and especially for the young one. Howell is not really the realist he claims to be, or at least such realism as characterizes "The Minister's Charge," "A Modern Instance," "The Rise of Silas Lapham" and "A World of Chance," is a variety of the quality altogether different from the unrelieved dirt-painting of Emile Zola and his imitators. The delightful humor of Frank Stockton, the author of "Rudder Grange" is free from taint of grossness or irreverence; and much of the work of Bret Harte, Thos. Hardy, Robert Louis Stevenson and Thos. A. Janvier, is wholesomely pleasant reading.

Of novelists whose books may be condemned without much scruple, we may mention Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Mrs. Vernon Lee, George Sand, Ouida, Rhoda Broughton, Bertha M. Clay, Amelia Rives and the Duchess. These do not all belong to the same category; their literary product ranges from anti-Christian philosophy, through pessimistic cynicism and sensationalism run wild, to utter insipidity dashed with more or less lewdness; but the best of that product possesses no merit that compensates for its faults.

Although "novels by Catholic authors" and "Catholic novels" are unfortunately not always synonymous phrases, there is a certain sense of security engendered by even the less assertive designation; one feels that at least the chances are in favor of such books being free from agnostic vaporings, correct in moral tendency, and reverent in tone. And such, we are happy to believe, are, with rare exceptions, the contributions of Catholics to the store of English fiction. To enumerate them all is not our purpose here; but a partial list may possibly be a help to some whose reading has run in other lines.

Of Catholic novels, then, or novels of Catholics, we have Wiseman's "Fabiola;" Newman's "Calista," and "Loss and Gain;" Keon's "Dion and the Sybils;" Marion Crawford's "Saracinesca," "Sant' Ilario," "Don Orsino," "Marcio's Crucifix," "A Cigarette-maker's Romance," "Paul Patoff," and "A Roman Singer;" Maurice F. Egan's "The disappearance of John Longworthy" and "The Success

of Patrick Desmond ; " Miss Tinker's "The House of York" and "Grapes and Thorns ;" Lady Georgiana Fullerton's "Constance Sherwood," "A Will and a Way, " Too Strange not to be True" and "Mrs. Gerald's Niece ;" Christian Reid's "A Heart of Steel," "Armine," "A Child of Mary," "Morton House," "Carmela," "Philip's Restitution," and "A Little Maid of Arcady ;" Boyle O'Reilly's "Moondyne ;" Kathleen O'Meara's "Narka ;"[1] Mrs. Craven's "A Sister's Story," "Eliane," "Fleurange," and "Lucie ;" J. C. Heywood's "Lady Merton ;" Rose Mulholland's "The Wicked Woods of Tobevervil," "The Birds of Killeevy," and "Marcella Grace ;" F. S. D. Ames' ; "Marion Howard," and "Wishes on Wings ;" Dr. Barry's "The New Antigone ;" and not to be tedious, many other worthy volumes by Catholics as fervent as Mrs. Dorsey and Mrs. Sadlier, and as artistic in touch as Richard Malcolm Johnston and Justin McCarthy.

With such works as these from which to chose it is surely pitiable that there should be found in Catholic households novels whose utter trashiness can serve no other purpose than to give distorted views of life and human nature, becloud the spiritual sight, and lethargize the moral sense : and hence to steer the novel-reader into the channels of legitimate fiction may easily be a real duty as well as a genuine kindness. It is superfluous to add that even in these channels one may sail too constantly. Fiction should be the condiment of mental food : to use it as a principal article of diet is to produce mental anæmia ; and to partake of it alone, to the exclusion of more substantial aliment, is to court intellectual starvation. A mind fed solely with novels—even the best novels—can no more preserve its vigor and robustness than can a body fed solely with ice cream and bon-bons. As an occasional relaxation from mental work, the reading of a good novel may have its rightful place in the best-ordered life ; as a constant occupation during every hour of leisure

1 A book worth any dozen in this list is Miss O'Meara's *Frederic Ozanam*, a model biography of a model Catholic.

that can be earned or stolen, such reading is a real injury to the intellectual and spiritual faculties, and moreover an inexcusable waste of time.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

(THIRTEENTH ARTICLE.)

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY II.

How conservative and progressive.

CONSIDERED in its object, Dogmatic Theology is the highest and noblest of studies. It deals with the most important of all problems; it has engaged the greatest intellects of Christian ages; its conclusions concern the whole human race, and stretch out from time into eternity. Yet the general absorbing interest which it excited in former times has in a great measure disappeared. It is still studied as necessary preparation for the priesthood; but of those who are thus initiated into it, comparatively few make it an object of special study in after-life.

This practical disregard arises from diverse causes. Besides the abstract character of its truths and the dryness of its forms, theology, such as it is taught in the schools or found in books, proves to some minds unsatisfactory and disappointing. It strikes them as being full of arbitrary assumptions; often weak or conventional in proof; busy with speculations arising from conditions of mind which have become foreign to the present age, and silent on the questions to which the men of to-day seek an answer. Again there are those who never go back to dogmatic studies, not because they question their solidity or their usefulness, but because they find nothing in them of the attractiveness which new facts, fresh thought, expansiveness and life give to most modern forms of knowledge. Theology, as understood by them, is a

science fixed long since in all its points and bearings, to be learned, like elementary mathematics, once for all, and after that to be reverted to as little as one thinks of revising his geometry or his algebra.

Candor forbids us to say that there is nothing in the past or in the present of theology to lend color to such impressions. But we believe that they arise from what is accidental in the science, not from its essence; and this, we hope, will become sufficiently apparent as we endeavor briefly to recall something of the true nature, of the laws, the limitations and the methods of theology, as a science and as a study.

The objection of unprogressiveness, to begin with, arises and can arise only from an imperfect conception of what theology really is. For, of its very nature, theology is equally subject to two distinct laws or tendencies: the law of conservation and the law of development and consequent progress. As directed by human hands either of the two tendencies may be developed at the cost, even to the destruction of the other; but always with detriment to the science itself. The progressive tendency, if unchecked, would soon emancipate it from authority and do away with all definitive settled beliefs, while pure conservatism would lead only to stagnation. The true course of theology, therefore, like that of the heavenly bodies through space, is found in due obedience to two distinct and in some sense, antagonistic forces. But the question is in what manner and measure each of these forces should come into play. A fundamental question indeed, covering the entire field of Dogmatic Theology, and this is why we purpose devoting to it the whole of the present paper.

I.

First of all, then, Catholic Theology is bound to be, and has always been, strongly conservative. It is conservative like all that rests on authority. It is conservative because its primary law is to cling indissolubly to whatever it recognizes as an undoubted element of divine truth or as an evident consequence of it. It clings instinctively, though with

weaker hold, to what bears even the semblance of divine truth. The literal meaning of Scripture, if otherwise admissible; views commonly held by the Fathers; conclusions which have commended themselves to theologians of every school; time honored traditions; toward all these Catholic theology leans ostensibly and resents any irreverent or arbitrary action in their regard.

Again it shows a decided preference for certain methods of exposition or defence long in use, for certain forms of language and for the special vocabulary in which divine truths have become enshrined in the course of ages; even for the proofs originally introduced with effect by the Fathers in support of any Christian doctrine and reverently repeated by subsequent generations. In short Catholic Theology turns ever lovingly to the past and parts reluctantly with whatever has stood the test of time or has come down under the sanction of authority in any degree.

Confined within these limits, the tendency is above reproach, for it only applies the universal rules of intellectual prudence and common sense. But there is such a thing as blind conservatism, and theologians are not necessarily exempt from it. They may cling obstinately to antiquated notions, and go on repeating confidently weak, or even exploded arguments. They may, by unconscious exaggerations, extend the immutability and sacredness of divine truth to solutions and speculations which are but human, and, in their eagerness to preserve in its integrity the deposit of the faith, they may allow it to be overladen with worthless accretions which destroy, instead of enhancing, its purity and beauty.

Another feature of the conservative spirit is this: As it clings to what is old, so it dreads and dislikes what is new; and in this respect again Catholic Theology is true to its origin. *Quod audistis ab initio in vobis permaneat*, writes S. John (I. v, 24) and S. Paul: *Depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates* (I Tim. vi, 19). Heretics are always spoken of by the Fathers as innovators, and all new

doctrines they look upon as a departure from or, at the least, an addition to the purely divine deposit of the faith. The objections most strongly urged against the nascent heretics was the fact of their being new. Divine truth being first in possession, error could come only as a novelty. Hence the maxim of Tertullian: *Illud verius quod prius*, and the statement of S. Augustine: *Sola evangelica doctrina per excellentiam antiqua dicitur, ad invidiam falsæ quæ nova appellatur . . . Semper viris sanctis suspecta fuit novitas.* (Adv. Cresconium III, 59.) Yet here again there was room for exaggeration. For although divine revelation closed with the apostolic age, so that all doctrines of later date, and having no root in the past, could at best be looked upon only as human speculations, still an advance in various directions remained possible, as we shall see, which theologians have too often been slow to recognize, and have admitted, when driven to it, in too limited a measure. How often do we find them proceeding unconsciously on the principle that theology has long since said all it had to say, and can henceforth only repeat itself! Such of them as are of this disposition cease to think for themselves, or even to listen to those who think around them. They grow impatient with the vivid side-lights which break in upon them from new discoveries and altered judgments in the biblical or historical sciences, and carefully shut them out. They know already what to think on every important subject. At most, they may go back to one of the Fathers or to some favorite theologian, and their sole aim, if they teach, is to transmit what they have thus learned, and as they learned it, following the same unvarying round of statements, proofs, corollaries, questions, and answers, all definitive and, as a consequence, stereotyped and unchangeable.

If theology meant this and nothing more, we should hardly wonder to see it forsaken for more living and hopeful forms of knowledge. Happily when brought back to its true condition, it appears entirely different. We are no longer in presence of a torpid, lethargic system of ideas, but of a science overflowing with vigor and life and ever inciting

to new thought; as admirably progressive as it is truly conservative; as youthful in its eager curiosity and active researches as it is staid in its demeanor and venerable in its years.

II.

For progressiveness, as we have said, is a quality no less inherent to theology than its characteristic conservatism. "Shall we say," exclaims Vincent of Lerins," that religion (*i. e.* religious doctrine) is unprogressive in the Church of God? Far from it, the opposite is the fact. Faith is ever progressive, but ever unchanging, for progress means development without loss of identity." "It grows," he goes on to explain, "as childhood and youth grow into manhood, as the seed sown in the ground grows into the full ripeness of the harvest." (Commonit. Cap. xxiii.) The whole chapter should be read. It is the most remarkable in this connection that antiquity has left us. Vincent exhibits in it a keen intuition of the general law, and of the lines on which it works itself out. Let us endeavor to mark them more distinctly.

Considered simply as an object of human thought, theology is progressive, for all thought is of itself indefinitely expansive. Principles are inexhaustible in their consequences, and facts, properly interrogated, are suggestive of endless conclusions. All geometry is evolved out of a few simple axioms, and the highest laws of the universe were revealed to Newton by the falling of an apple. The mind of a man is a soil in which all new truth germinates and fructifies. No principle, no fact can enter into it without coming into contact with its antecedent elements and combining with them in an endless variety of shapes, each combination resulting in some new truth or some new aspect of truth which, in turn, may become the principle of other combinations more or less numerous or valuable in proportion as the mind is more active or the truth more pregnant. A single view may permeate, transform and expand indefinitely a whole science, as the theory of gravitation has done in astronomy, that of the conservation of energy in physics, or the principle of evolution in biology.

Can we imagine divine truth entering the mind of man without giving rise to a similar action and reaction, and with results in proportion with the interest which it awakened and with the breadth of the field over which it ranged? Indeed it is in this way that theology came into existence. For theology is but revelation submitted to the normal processes of human intellect, and we may picture to ourselves beforehand the way in which the operation was carried out.

God vouchsafed to speak to men, not to satisfy their curiosity, but to lead them to a higher life of which He himself was to be the end. The knowledge thus imparted was not given all together, nor in logical order, nor always explicitly and distinctly. Great truths were often but vaguely and, as it were, incidentally enunciated; facts and laws of the unseen world were but dimly shown; there were suggestions about God and His purposes, man and his destinies; enough to reveal to him the solemn seriousness of life, too little to satisfy his awakened curiosity. Even after Christ had come and His Apostles had echoed the divine message, there remained an unordered collection of doctrines, facts, intimations, some distinct and definite, others only implicit or uncertain; and even when put together, still incomplete and fragmentary.

Now we see at once what will be the action of the mind in presence of knowledge reaching it in conditions so little in keeping with its natural requirements. Its first impulse will be to look to what is most vital in the divine message, to dispel, so far as may be, what is obscure in its nature or in its expression, to realize its full meaning and to follow it out in its speculative and in its practical consequences.

The next effort will be to find a reply to the many questions which revelation gives rise to, but fails to answer; to complete, in other words, a system of knowledge which God chose to leave imperfect. For in what interests the mind, imperfect knowledge always seeks to complete itself. Where direct information is unattainable, the usual methods of discovery are appealed to: induction and deduction, or the less satisfactory processes, leading only to imperfect knowledge, such as analogical argument, hypothesis, conjecture and the like.

Where there is question of divine truth it will be chiefly sought for in the speculations of the Fathers, or in the intimations, however vague, of Sacred Writ.

Lastly, in minds fashioned by the logical methods of Greece and Rome, there will be a need to establish order and consecutiveness among the unconnected elements thus brought together and to fashion them into a complex, yet real organic unity.

Now this, we need hardly say, is exactly the course of development which divine Revelation has followed in the lapse of ages. Its fundamental teachings were the first to be determined in all their purity and fulness, and this was the great dogmatic work of the five or six first centuries of the Christian era. The deduction of their ultimate consequences and the evolution of that vast body of current doctrines which never rose to the dignity of dogmatic faith, though early begun, belong mainly to a subsequent period. Organization came last, being almost entirely the work of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

From these facts we may already appreciate the value of the current notion, that the light of divine truth was at its brightest in the early days of the Church. From the nature of the case as well as from the history of doctrine, we see that this can be true only in a very qualified sense. The Apostles themselves, during the life-time of our Lord, had understood His doctrines but very imperfectly, and on the eve of His death He told them expressly (Joan. xvi, 12) that many things remained to be taught them which they were still unfit to receive, and that this was to be the work of the Spirit about to come upon them. The measure of enlightenment imparted to them on His coming was undoubtedly great; it was surely equal to the purpose for which they had been chosen. More than that we cannot know. There is no sufficient reason to believe that they were all equally enlightened. St. Peter, referring to St. Paul, seems to imply that his gifts were of a higher order, and the writings of the great Apostle convey a similar conclusion. Neither do they appear to have received

together all the lights which their subsequent ministry might require, nor to have understood at once its full scope and purpose, else the visions of St. Peter (Act. x, xi.) would have been needless. At no time can they be supposed to have perceived the numberless consequences which it took ages to deduce from the great truths which it was their privilege to convey to mankind. The main doctrines of the faith they doubtless saw with a distinctness and a vividness scarce ever to be equaled; but unless we suppose their minds to have been totally withdrawn from the ordinary laws of the human intelligence, much must have remained in them to the end imperfect and undeveloped.

This was clearly the case with those who came after them. Side by side with doctrines already distinctly conceived and as accurately formulated as at any subsequent period, we find darkness, hesitation, sometimes positive error, in regard to truths proclaimed later on as an undoubted portion of the divine heritage. Hundreds of African and Eastern bishops, with St. Cyprian as their leader, denied or doubted that baptism could be conferred validly by any but the orthodox. The doctrine of the Trinity was explicitly believed in from the beginning, yet from the time it became the object of active, searching thought, it took the Church more than a century to train her children to think and speak of it with accuracy. Christ was known from the first to all Christians as the very centre of their religion; yet the full intelligence of His two-fold nature and of the true relations in which His divinity and His humanity stood to one another came only after much ardent controversy and the holding of many councils.

The same may be said of the doctrines of grace, of the sacraments, of original sin, and of many others. The starting point is a sort of general conception of the divine truth, substantially correct, but obscure, or vague, or involved in some other truth in which it is seen but dimly. To make it distinct, reflection is necessary, and reflection arises from the natural working of the mind or still more from contradiction. For just as the loss of what is dear to us serves most to reveal its value, so opposition to our implicit convic-

tions serves but to bring them out with distinctness and vigor. It is in this way that heresy has done more than aught else to give precision and emphasis to orthodox doctrine.

Yet it must be admitted that most of what is called Catholic Theology came into existence in answer, not to heresy but to the craving of the Christian mind to know more of the divine economy and of things unseen than God had chosen directly to reveal. How much, for instance, one longs to know, yet how little we are told in Holy Writ, of the original condition of our first parents and of the abiding consequences of their fall! Again can anything be of more interest to the believer than what concerns heaven, purgatory or hell? What more calculated to arouse his curiosity than that invisible world of angelic spirits, amidst which he is taught that he lives and moves as really as amid his earthly surroundings?

To these and to hundreds of similar questions theology undertook to give a reply, and it must be acknowledged that in the performance of the task, a wonderful amount of sagacity has been displayed. To pierce the darkness and compensate for the lack of positive information, the faintest rays of light were brought together; expressions of the sacred writers, suggestions of the Fathers, principles of philosophy, facts of history, the laws of human nature and the experiences of life, every known source of knowledge was appealed to and made to help in solving the countless questions which arose. The results thus reached are often marvelous when compared with the original information from which they have been evolved. We admire the ingenuity of the archæologist reconstructing a whole inscription from a few broken and incoherent words. We follow with keen interest the historian, as he gathers information from all sides and of all degrees of trustworthiness, tests them with his intuitive critical gift, expands and supplements them by means of his broader knowledge and his constructive historic

imagination, and thus on the groundwork of hopelessly imperfect annals, builds up a consecutive history, which we feel to be substantially true. The work of the theologian, pursued by similar methods, is not less deserving of admiration nor less fruitful in its results. These results may vary in their intrinsic value from what is morally certain to what is merely conjectural; but as a whole they meet one of the most imperative demands of the Christian mind and add much to the invaluable treasure of religious doctrine.

This accounts for the readiness and even real delight with which the Fathers, and later on, the great theologians devote themselves to that manner of inquiry, revealing the incessant working of their own minds and the endless questioning of others on the great problems of the supernatural order. To confine ourselves to single instances, it is easy to see that many of the more valuable contributions of St. Augustine to Christian thought were elicited by the questions which came to him from all parts of the Church, and that most of the problems dealt with by St. Thomas were originated before him and around him.

III.

Theology, then, is progressive, essentially progressive, not after the fashion of the physical sciences, but like history and philosophy, upon which it is mainly built. It has grown, like all living things, by gradual expansion of what first appeared but in embryo. The work of Christian ages has been to emphasize what was clear from the beginning, to draw out what was involved, to elucidate what was obscure, to give accuracy, precision, logical coherence to what was but vague and unconnected, to convey to the mass of Christians truths which in the origin were confined to a few churches or to a few minds. It was pursued very unequally. There were periods of extreme activity, such as the third, fourth and fifth centuries in the early Church, and the twelfth and thirteenth in the Middle Ages, followed in each case by periods of seeming exhaustion. The Greek mind, so active and so fertile in the beginning, becomes utterly stagnant and barren after the sixth century. The Latin

Church overrun by the barbarians, loses the traditions as well as the practical requirements of progressive thought. A sense of their inferiority as compared with the brilliant past of the preceding ages seems to forbid men to think for themselves in anything bearing on religion, or to attempt seeing beyond what had been seen before them. Their reverence for the Fathers is unbounded. To gather in as much as possible of their knowledge and wisdom for the benefit of present and future generations is their only object, and theology in their hands becomes like the hieratic arts of ancient Egypt or of mediæval Greece, where the sole aim of the artist was to reproduce conventional types of gods or of saints, without any freedom to modify the traditional forms or to display his own individual conceptions or tastes.

This passive, quiescent state of mind disappeared, as we know, before the great scholastic movement, characterized, especially in its beginnings, by extraordinary intellectual power and originality of thought. Curiously enough, it reappeared, at least as a theory, with the greatest innovation of Christian ages, the so-called Protestant Reformation; its originators claiming to gather their whole faith ready made from the Bible, and refusing to take heed of all else. We find it often since giving a special tone to certain Catholic schools, less however as an avowed principle, than as the instinct of a conservative and sometimes narrow orthodoxy. But the whole trend of modern thought, even in theological schools, is against it, and the historical study of Christian doctrines has already dealt it a blow from which it cannot recover.

Of itself the progressive movement is destined to go on indefinitely, and can be stayed only by accidental and transient circumstances. However much has been done, much more remains to do. The eternal problems of the divine nature and of the human soul are ever before us, beckoning to us, as it were, and tempting us to try our strength upon them. The greatest intellects it is true, have grappled with them unsuccessfully. Yet, although they failed to wrest their secret, still they have lifted something of the dark cloud

which hung around them and left a hope that more may be done. Anyhow it is contrary to the nature of man having a sense of intellectual power to settle down contentedly in unsolved mystery.

Again there are problems, long since solved after a fashion, but never in a way to give full satisfaction to the mind. Such are those that gather around divine Providence, prayer, grace, predestination, etc. It is the delight of the vigorous and original thinker to try his strength on them and prepare, even if he cannot reach, a complete solution. But still more inviting and more pressing are the questions which arise from the general progress of human thought in its bearing on revealed truth. The mind of man is steadily advancing in certain directions and shifting its ground in others. History, philosophy, biblical criticism, social science, every new departure or new development of mind has something new to say or to ask regarding religion. It is the mission of theology to answer, and the task is simply endless. The whole field of historical theology opened up by the French theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Petau, Thomassin, Morin, Vitasse, etc., and renovated in our day by Newman, Oxenham, Klee, Kuhn, etc., still remains rich in promise and, in many of its departments, comparatively untouched.

There are many other aspects in the sacred science which call no less for renovation. We shall touch upon them later on; but enough has been already said to show that theology is something entirely different from these cold, lifeless forms under which it has been so often worshiped by some and avoided or forsaken by others; and that, besides being the noblest and most important, it becomes, when properly understood, one of the most attractive forms of study, still retaining after its evolution through so many ages, all the suppleness and buoyancy as well as the progressive spirit of youthful life.

J. HOGAN.

DE MATRIMONIORUM MIXTORUM CELEBRATIONE.[1]

1. Tria in celebratione mixtorum matrimoniorum respicienda sunt: I. *Proclamationes* eorum infra missarum solemnia. II. *Assistentia passiva* Parochi, in eo consistens, ut haec conjugia extra Ecclesiam, in loco tamen honesto, v. gr. in sacristia, in capella privata,[2] in domo parochiali etc.; absque benedictione ulloque alio ritu ecclesiastico contrahantur. Unde apud eam omittendae sunt ceremoniae *Ritualis*, scil. verba: *Ego vos conjungo etc.*,[3] benedictio annuli caeteraeque orationes, benedictio nuptialis in Missali unacum Missa de sponso et sponsa, item alia Missa, si "ea habeatur tanquam complementum caeremoniae matrimonii;"[4] et parochus absque usu alicujus vestis sacrae, ut superpellicei et stolae,[5] tanquam *testis qualificatus* vel *authorizabilis* simul cum reliquis testibus mere praesens audit mutuum partium consensum et in libro matrimoniorum inscribit. Non tamen repugnat huic assistentiae passivae, ut, pro more nostro,[6] Parochus partes *interroget* de consensu eumque recipiat aut monitionem vel concionem faciat de vinculo matrimonii etc., arbitrio tamen Ordinarii.[7] III. *Assistentia activa* Parochi, in eo consistens, ut adhibeatur ritus pro matrimoniis contrahendis in Dioecesano Rituali legitime praescriptus,[8] exclusa tamen semper Missae celebratione.

2. Antequam procedam ad singula, generalia quaedam praemitto:

a. Nemo ignorat, primitus etiam in illis mixtis matrimoniis in quibus solitae *cautiones* ex parte tum acatholica tum catholica quoad religionem praestitae fuerunt, assistentiam mere passivam sine proclamationibus praecedentibus permissam vel potius toleratam fuisse, nullam omnino vero in iis, quae absque his cautionibus attentata sunt.

1 Remissio ad pag. 172 et 213 hujus libri periodici.
2 S. Off 17 Jan. 1887 ap. Gasparri; *Tract. de Matr.* Paris 1891. n. 463.
3 S. Off. 26. Nov. 1835 ib. n. 463.
4 S. Off. 17. Jan. 1872 ib. n. 463.
5 Gasparri n. 463.
6 Excerpta Rit. Rom. ed. 8 p. 242.
7 Gasparri ib.
8 Excerpta p. 204.

b. Hoc jus *generatim* adhuc valet in Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Belgio, etc. At cum sit rubricalis praescriptio, ab Ecclesia urgentibus rerum circumstantiis mutari et mitigari potest.

c. Mitigatio hujus juris expresse a S. Sede, ut ex pluribus instructionibus elucet, pro Germania, Austria, Hungaria, etc., concessa est. Declaravit scil. Sedes Apostolica tolerari posse, ut parochus etiam iis matrimoniis mixtis assistentiam passivam praestaret, in quibus nihil cautum fuerit de prolis educatione neque in catholica neque in acatholica religione. Imo quandoque toleratum est, ut etiam proclamationes his matrimoniis praemitterentur. Causae hujus tolerantiae duae sunt: lex civilis, quae parochum sub gravibus poenis cogit ad assistendum—et impossibilitas matrimonium impediendi quin oriantur gravia damna, "si insuper Ecclesiae utilitati communique bono expedire videatur, ut illud quantumvis illicitum coram catholico parocho potius quam coram ministro acatholico, ad quem partes facile confugerent, contrahatur."—Huc spectant Breve Pii VIII ad Episcopos provinciae Coloniensis de 25 Mart. 1830, una cum instructione Card. Albani de 27 Mart. 1830;—instructio Card. Bernetti ad Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Bavariae de 12, Sept. 1834;—Breve Gregorii XVI, cum instructione Card. Lambruschini de 30 Apr. 1831, ad Primatem, Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Hungariae;—instructio Card. Lambruschini ad Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Austriacae Ditionis in foederatis Germanie partibus de 22 Maji 1841, et plura alia ex antiquiori tempore.[1]

d. Mitigatio praedicta respexit solum casus, in quibus causae supra expositae adfuerunt. Attamen iisdem in regionibus simul invaluit opinio, juxta quam licitum esset, in matrimoniis mixtis, si contraherentur cum cautionibus et dispensatione Apostolica, adhibere proclamationes et assistentiam *activam.* Eam defendit etiam Binterim, quem refutat Feije.[2] Indirecte ad praxin huic opinioni consentaneam

1 Preacedentes epistolas et instructiones collectas habes in egregio opere: Weber: *Die Kanon. Ehehindernisse.* Freiburg, 1886, p. 444-472.

2 *De mixtis matr.* Lovaniae 1847 p. 244.

introducendam forsan aliquid contulit lex illa civilis Borussiae de 17 Aug. 1825, qua cautum fuit etiam pro provinciis Rhenenis Westphalicis, ut in matrimoniis mixtis liberi utriusque sexus in religione patris aut ad ejus arbitrium educarentur, simulque sacerdotibus interdictum, ne a personis matrimonia hujusmodi contracturis ullam exigerent super religiosa nasciturae prolis institutione sponsionem. Legem hanc Archiepiscopus Coloniensis, Comes de Spiegel, circumventus a ministro Bunsen, posthabitis instructionibus S. Sedis, necnon ejus suffraganei tanquam normam agendi in matrimoniis mixtis promulgaverunt suo Clero Dioecesano. Quo factum est, ut Archiepiscopus successor s. m. Clemens Augustus de Droste-Vischering, necnon Martinus de Lubin Archiepiscopus Posoniae et Gnesniae in vincula conjicerentur. At exinde res circa hoc punctum disciplinae ecclesiasticae in melius mutatae sunt. Haec omnia jam in historiam transierunt.[1]

e. Praxis quoad matrimoniorum mixtorum celebrationem ex illo tempore in Germania, Austria, Hungaria, etc., vigens, est haec:

(*a.*) Matrimonia praeviis cautionibus dispensationeque Apostolica ineuntur cum proclamationibus, in quibus vero mentio diversitatis religionis non fit, et cum assistentia activa Parochi Catholici.[2]

Excipiuntur soli *veteres catholici* de quibus in instructione S. Officii de 17 Sept., 1871, a Pio IX, confirmata et ad Episcopos Bavariae transmissa dicitur: "Quodsi contingat, ut una pars catholica cum altera neohaeretica nuptias contrahere velit, Episcopi praevio parochorum recursu, se gerant ad formam instructionis diei 12 Septembris, 1834 (*i. e.*, passivam assistentiam tantum tolerando), adimpletis omnibus conditionibus et cautionibus in eadem instructione expressis."

1 Rohrbacher: *Hist. univ. de l'eglise cath.* Liege 1849. Tom. 28. p. 318. seq. Alzog (Pabisch and Byrne) *Man. of Ch. Hist.* Cincinnati, 1878. vol. iii. p. 762.

2 Weber l. c. p. 416, Matth. Joseph Binder's (nunc Episcopi S. Hippoliti) *Handbuch des Kath. Eherechtes* von Scheicher. Freiburg 1887, p. 188. 242 —Schuch: *Pastoral-Theol.* Innsbruck 1885, p. 328.

In aliis regionibus Germaniae hoc in casu nec praestitis cautionibus datur dispensatio. Nam cum Henricus Episcopus Wratislaviensis (v. Breslau) petens prolongationem sui indulti super impedimento mixtae religionis, quaesivisset num praedicto indulto etiam ad modum Episcoporum Bavariae uti posset in casibus, ubi asseclae novae sectae, quae se *vetero-catholicam* nuncupat, matrimonium inire cupiunt cum Romano-catholicis datis cautionibus . . . requisitis? S. Congr. Inquis. respondit: *Negative*[1] et P. Card. Patrizi in litteris die 31 Jan., 1874, ad eum datis pro ratione attulit, "remedium adsistentiae mere passivae . . . ideo Episcopis Bavariae fuisse permissum, ut ipsi ac Parochi ad incitationes redacti a lege civili, quae praevidebatur coactionem ad adsistentiam inducturam fore, a gravibus incommodis ac poenis subtraherentur. Ast haudquaquam innotescit num istinc (scil. Wratislaviae) eo res perducta usque fuerit, ut insuetum illud temperamentum invocare opus sit: praesertim quia adhibendum esset cum neoschismaticis a quibus in praesenti motuum aestu fidelis cautionum observantia incassum speranda foret: quin potius ad proselytismum augendum nil intentatum relinquerent, ut partem catholicam et dein prolem ad apostasiam impellerent."[2]

Hic modus assistentiae activae, de quo vixdum supra, Sanctae Sedi probe cognitus numquam revocatus aut vituperatus est. Imo Gregorius XVI, in Brevi ad Episcopum Friburgensem[3] de die 23 Maji, 1846 dicit: "Quod *Benedictionem* attinet, eam, veluti optime noscis, haec Apostolica Sedes prohibere consuevit in illis quoque matrimoniis, quae inter catholicos et acatholicos ineuntur, impetrata ejusdem Sedis venia atque adhibitis cautionibus in illa praescriptis. Atque etsi deinde *tolerari* potuerit, ut mos in nonnullis regionibus inductus *servaretur benedicendi matrimoniis mixtis initis cum Ecclesiae venia et praedictis cautionibus*, nun-

1 Num Episcopi nostri vi Articuli 4. Formulae D. catholicum cum vetero-catholica praestitis cautionibus matrimonium inire cupientem dispensare possint?

2 Weber p. 427, 428.

3 In REVIEW, p. 214 erronee dicitur: "of Freising."

quam tamen toleranda est eadem benedictio in iis casibus, in quibus nulla accedente Ecclesiae venia nec praeviis necessariis cautionibus," etc.[1]

Adverto hic, duplicem distingui matrimonii benedictionem, unam *ordinariam*, quae in omni matrimonio, quod inter catholicos celebratur, occurrit et continetur verbis: *Ego vos conjungo, etc.*, alteram quae est *benedictio solemnis* et juxta Rit. Rom. et Bened. XIV. continetur in Missa *pro sponso et sponsa* vel si haec dici nequit, in Missa dici, addita oratione pro sponso et sponsa ex Missa praedicta, inque aliis orationibus, quae post *Pater Noster* et *Ite Missa est* proferuntur. Si de benedictione matrimoniorum mixtorum sermo est, ordinaria semper intelligitur, numquam solemnis[2]

(*b.*) Ea matrimonia mixta, quae ineuntur absque venia S. Sedis sive quia cautiones solitae non praestantur sive quia deficit causa canonica, in regionibus praedictis generatim proclamantur infra Missarum Solemnia, et nisi obstet aliud impedimentum aut partes expresse coram ministro acatholico contrahere intendant, cum Parochi catholici assistentia, passive tamen, celebrantur.[3] Hac de re plura, si lubet, relegi possunt in Decretis *Concilii Provincialis Strigoniensis* (Gran) de anno, 1858, et *Conc. Prov. Pragensis* de anno, 1860, quorum, utrumque a S. C. Conc. recognitum fuit.[4]

3. Ea quae in praecedentibus exposita sunt, si solertius conferuntur cum duplici institutione in *Conc. Plen. Balt. II*, p. 311 et 344 inserta, ut puto, non parum luminis effundunt in intentionem, quam Summus Legislator in dictis instructionibus prosequi, voluit. Videntur enim hae instructiones quasi extremos limites ponere, quos S. Sedes praetergredi amplius non vult in suis concessionibus quoad celebrationem matrimoniorum mixtorum.

4. Sed jam transeundum est ad ea, quae celebrationi matrimoniorum mixtorum peculiaria sunt praesertim quoad regiones nostras.

I.—*Proclamationes* in matrimoniis mixtis ex jure communi vetitas esse etiam quando cum dispensatione Apostolica ineuntur, supra dictum est; at negari nequit, S. Sedem

1 Weber p. 416.
2 Feije *de matr. mixt.* p. 230.
3 Weber, p. 418, Binder—Scheicher, p 244.
4 Cfr. *Coll. Lacens.* vol. v, col. 27, 28 et 521.

hodie a priori rigore multum recessisse. Hoc constat ex variis ejus responsis, quae collecta inveniuntur apud Feije *de imped. matr.* ed. 3. n. 571, pag. 451 (3) et Konings *Comp. Theol. mor.* Vol. ii, pag. 395, ubi quidem id, quod ex litteris Card. Fransoni de 3. Jul. 1847, occasione Decreti tertii *Concilii Provinc. Balt. IV.* rescriptum est, tum ex Heiss *de matr.* p. 414 et 424, tum ex ed. 2. *Excerptorum Rit. Rom.* tum ex Rescripto Cardinalis Franchi ad Archiep. Oregonen. de 28. Sept. 1874 mendo ex incuria amanuensis commisso tribuitur, at plura proferuntur, ex quibus clare eruitur, proclamationes in matrimoniis mixtis utique fieri posse, quoties judicio Ordinarii necessariae et opportunae videantur ad detegenda impedimenta, mentione tamen religionis omissa. Idem decisum fuit in S. Off. 11. Maji. 1871, uti refert Zitelli *de dispensationibus matrimonialibus* Romae 1887 p. 60.

Ex quibus omnibus cum Feije l. c. concludere licet, hodie proclamationes in mixtis matrimoniis ubique permitti, sed *non absolute, verum si ad detegenda impedimenta necessarium et opportunum judicet Ordinarius*, prout hoc expresse additum est ed. 8. *Excerpt. Rit. Rom.* p. 242.

His suppositis Episcopus Nesqualiensis dubium proposuit: Utrum sicut in mixtis matrimoniis, ita et in conjugiis inter catholicos et infideles permissa sint banna seu proclamationes? C. S. Officii 4 Julii, 1874 reposuit:[1] "Posse fieri proclamationes in matrimoniis, de quibus agitur, quatenus Apostolica dispensatione contrahantur, suppressa tamen religione contrahentium." S. C. ulterius mentem suam ita declaravit: "Mens tamen est Em. PP. ut huic responsioni adjungatur epistola ad. Dom. Episcopum, in qua ei significentur quod, quum possit sive a curia (episcopali) aut ab aliquo vices ejus agente libertas status contrahentium certior fieri, observatis normis a Clem. X. s. m. praescriptis in instructione diei 11 Aug., 1670,[2] saltem in aliquibus casibus et cir-

1 Gasparri n. 621. In REVIEW p. 174, ad idem dubium Responsum de 14 Julii, 1874, Episcopo Blanchet datum allegatur. Optandum est, ut publicetur integrum Responsum.

2 Eam habes apud Lucidi: *De visitatione liminium.* ed. 3. Romae 1883. Vol. iii, p. 603. Adde ea, quae sunt p. 604, usque 613.—Plura ap. Feije *de imp.* n. 254 seq.—Apud nos haec instructio observari non potest.

cumstantiis magis expediret a praedictis bannis *dispensare*[1] ad evitandum admirationis vel scandali periculum: quod tamen ejus prudent arbitrio relinquitur." Id quod ex praefato Responso sequitur, cuilibet lectori attento liquet; an autem id ex eo deduci possit, quod in REVIEW, p. 175, cl. scriptor ex suo deducit, attentus item lector judicet.

II.—*Assistentia* Parochi in celebratione matrimoniorum mixtorum apud nos mere passiva semper fuit nec activa ullo modo permittebatur, prout cuique constat ex usu universali et ex praescriptionibus Conciliorum ac Synodorum.—De activa in Decretis et Statutis Conciliorum ac Synodorum, ni fallor, nihil habetur; habetur tamen aliquid in Instructionibus de annis 1858 et 1868 *Concilio Plen. Balt. II.* additis, scil. ea *toleratur* "*ad majora damna ac mala vitanda*" tantum "diligentissime perpensis omnibus rerum, locorum, ac *personarum* adjunctis atque onerata Antistitum conscientia super omnium circumstantiarum veritate et gravitate." Insuper optat Sanctitas Sua, ut Antistite hujusmodi tolerantiam "majori, quo fieri potest, silentio ac secreto servent." Instr. de a. 1858 §. Quod si. (*Conc. Plen. Balt. II.* p. 313.). —Episcopi ergo, ut clare patet ex his verbis, etiam apud nos possunt assistentiam activam concedere in casibus singularibus. Requiritur enim non tantum rerum et locorum, sed etiam *personarum* adjunctarum perpensio diligentissima, nec non secretum. Hisce praemissis sponte sua quaestio exurgit: *a.* An apud nos unquam illa mala et damna majora occurrant, ad quae vitanda assistentia activa permitti possit? et *b.* In quo consistunt ista mala et damna majora? Quod respicit quaesitum sub *a.* parum apud Auctores invenitur. Solus P. Konings mentem suam aperit in *Commentario in facultates Apostolicas.* Benziger 1884 n. 160: "Quod nostras Provincias ecclesiasticas attinet,' ait, 'graviora' haec 'damna et mala,' ob quae Instructio tolerantiam illam admittit, nullibi, ut omnino existimamus, timenda sunt." Idem fere tenet *folium periodicum Pastorale.*[2]—Plane contrarium habes in hoc nostro libello periodico pag. 179:

1. S. Officium ergo supponit usum proclamandi omnia matrimonia mixta.
2 *Pastoralblatt fur Nordamerika.* St. Louis 1875. p. 101.

"*Conclusion.* If the Church allows the contracting of such marriages in church, let us not deny this privilege to those who desire it."—De hoc infra—*b.* Quoad secundum habemus authenticam interpretationem in Responso S. Officii de 4. Dec. 1862 ad dubia Vicarii Apostolici Maysurii et a S. Congr. de Prop. Fide omnibus Vicariis Apostolicis Indiae transmisso.[1] "Primo quid intelligendum sit sciscitaris per verba, quibus in laudata instructione" (de 1858) "innititur et quasi ligatur facultas seu tolerantia benedicendi mixta matrimonia, scilicet ad evitanda *graviora mala et damna.* Procul dubio graviora inde oriuntur mala et damna: 1. quotiescumque ob denegatam matrimoniis mixtis benedictionem facile excitarentur haereticorum quaerimoniae et odia adversus fideles legesque ecclesiasticas: 2. quotiescumque denegata a parocho catholico benedictione sponsi, ante vel post coram illo celebratum matrimonium, ministellum adeant, vel etiam in heterodoxorum templum conveniant ad sacrilegam benedictionem obtinendam, parocho catholico omnino posthabito: 3. quotiescumque insuper timendum esset quod, recusata ab ipsis expetita benedictione aut non servarentur necessariae cautiones de amovendo a catholico conjuge perversionis periculo et de universa prole in catholica religione educanda, aut, quod detestabilius foret, ne pars catholica ad haereticorum castra in sui et futurae prolis aeternam perniciem transiret. Evidenter haec *et similia* sunt gravia illa damna ac mala." Additur dein, Praesules ob locorum distantiam etiam per Missionarios zelo secundum scientiam praeditos et a se bene circa hanc rem instructos hanc facultatem de matrimoniis mixtis benedicendis exercere posse: et quoad secretum in instructione praescriptum prosequitur, illud non esse presse intelligendum, ut nemini innotescat. "Etenim . . . Sanctitas Sua monitos esse voluit Praesules ut *non passim* et *absque delectu* matrimoniis mixtis benedictio impertiatur, *nec per publicas instructiones*, veluti etiam *per modum regulae*, tali utantur facultate, sed prudenter admodum et caute, ut oblivioni non tradantur saluberri-

1 *Collectanea* Paris, 1880 n. 908.—*Nouv. Revue Theol.* XV. p. 586.—Gasparri n. 165.—Feije n. 572. et pag. 827.

mae Ecclesiae conditiones, quae semper implicite talibus dispensationibus adjunctae intelliguntur."

Jam vero si Reverendissimus Antistes, cujus nomen—et fateor optime—reticitum est, in sua expositione, quam certe ceu problema potius quam serio publicavit, nihil aliud intendit, nisi id, quod huic authenticae interpretationi consonum est quis erit, qui ei aliquid opponat?—At si recte intelligo, quae ab eo exposita sunt, Dominus Illustrissimus ulterius progredi intendit eaque omnia matrimonia benedicere, quorum benedictionem partes quoquo modo exoptant—aliis verbis: id fere vult introducere, quod in Germania et Austria communiter in usu est quoad assistentiam activam. Quomodo hoc perficietur? Non ex facultatibus Instructionum supra allegatarum, quorum limites multo strictiores sunt, prout ex dictis liquet. Non ex novis facultatibus S. Sedis, utpote quas nec Episcopis Germaniae et Austriae quidem umquam concessit. Porro si assistentia activa omnibus eam desiderantibus concedenda esset, utique passiva reservanda esset iis matrimoniis in quibus dispensatio Apostolica sive ob defectum causae sive ob non praestitas aut non sufficienter praestitas cautiones denegatur, modo contractus de prole in haeresi educanda aut propositum de matrimonio coram haeretico praecone ineundo non exprimatur. Eam suadent eaedem rationes, quae a Rdmo Praesule pro assistentia activa allegantur. Ea insuper expresse toleratur in Germania et Austria.

"At offenditur pars acatholica, si, postquam omnia ab ecclesia catholica postulata praestitit, ei nec conceditur, ut die nuptiarum Ecclesiam intret!" Ita sane! Quasi acatholicus per cautiones catholicae Ecclesiae magnum servitium praestitisset, quod tale praemium mereretur! Verum procedamus practice.

A. Catholicus cum B. acatholica comparet coram parocho catholico manifestans suam intentionem quoad matrimonium simulque aperiens cautiones solitas causasque graves pro dispensatione obtinenda ad esse. Parochus ex officio suo catholico coram sponsa acatholica difficultates quoad liberos, qui sperantur educandos dilucide exponit addens, hac de

causa praesertim *aegre tantum* dispensationem dari, nec *de regula* concedi, ut matrimonium celebretur cum benedictione Sacerdotis in Ecclesia. Pars acatholica ea quae audit, vix non probabit ; imo parochus poterit eam saepe, ni semper admonere, ut sedulo inquiret in veritatem suae religionis et ut veritatem religionis catholicae cognitam amplectatur, quo facto matrimonium nunc quidem valide ineundum postea *solemni* benedictione condecorandum sit ex concessione et jussu S. Pontificis Leonis XIII, per Decr. S. Off. de 31 Aug., 1881,[1] ubi dicitur: "hortandos esse conjuges catholicos, qui benedictionem sui matrimonii non obtinuerunt, ut eam primo quoque tempore petant." Jam audeo rogare omnes, qui vel parum in praxi versati sunt, ut dicant, ex mille casibus unum accidisse, in quo nupturientes tales, ita fere tractati, offensi abiissent. Si vero eo quod parochus dixit *de regula* non dari benedictionem, exceptionem interdum, causis pro hac investigatis et existentibus, utique recurri potest ad Episcopum aut ejus delegatum pro facultate assistentiae activae. Putat demum Rmus Antistes, scandalum inter catholicos oriturum non esse, si omnia matrimonia mixta pro quibus ineundis conceditur dispensatio, benedicantur. At pace Rdmi Domini equidem hoc nego et pernego. Matrimonia mixta sunt seminaria indifferentismi,[2] et quo faciliora, eo frequentiora evadunt. Si juvenes utriusque sexus videant, matrimonia mixta eo modo fere tractari, quo tractantur matrimonia omnino catholica, vix ullum retinebunt adversus illa horrorem, et parochi perniciem matrimoniorum mixtorum docentes vix fidem invenient. Experientia nimium clamat contra haec matrimonia, et ea, quae S. Officium ante aliquot annos per Circulare ad Episcopos quoad haec matrimonia inquisivit, sat manifeste loquuntur de strage inter animas fideles ab iisdem edita.[3] Sed satis de hoc. Reliqua., quae in favorem illius sententiae afferuntur, minoris momenti sunt, quam ut specialem considerationem mereantur.

1 *Conc. Plen. Balt.* III, pag. 248.

2 Cfr. Litteras Clem. XIII, de 16 Nov., 1763, ad Card. de Rohan, Ep. Argentoraten, ap. Kutschker: *Eherecht*, Wien 1857, vol. iv, p. 713, et Ioder: *Formulaire matr.*, Paris, 1888, p. 46.

3 Cfr. Gasparri, n 443, in fine.

Caeterum ne offendatur, quaeso, Rmus ac Illmus Antistes per ea, quae simplex sacerdos ex simplicitate cordis ei opponere ausus est, et reverenter annulum Episcopalem deosculanti benedictionem suam concedere dignetur.

J. P.

WITH THE IRISH PILGRIMAGE TO ROME.

MOST readers will have read something, before this, of the Irish Pilgrimage to Rome, on the occasion of the Episcopal jubilee of the Holy Father. But that splendid demonstration of faith and of loyalty to the Church suggests matter, worthy of more than passing reference; and a few extracts from the notebook of one of the pilgrims may be found not wholly devoid of interest. The record of the incidents of our journey and of the sight-seeing at Rome, and elsewhere, belongs to the province of the "Special Correspondent;" that useful servant of the public has done his duty for the readers of the daily press, at both sides of the Atlantic; and it is not my purpose in this paper to repeat what he has already told.

The idea of an Irish pilgrimage originated with his Eminence Cardinal Logue. When other nations would be sending their representatives to Rome, to rejoice in the joy of the common Father of the faithful, it was fitting, he thought, that Ireland would not be missing—Ireland which, during all its chequered history, had been conspicuous for devotion to the Church and to its supreme head. It was an undertaking of much difficulty and even of danger; but, in spite of the hardships inseparable from such a journey, it seemed to have been blessed from the beginning; and its organizers look, not without reason, for happy and lasting results. There were features, about it which, we have been informed, gave special joy to the Holy Father, and which must go far to make our pilgrimage from Ireland a precedent for similar occasions in the future. From beginning to end its distinctive character of a religious undertaking

was maintained ; and the pilgrim was never allowed to forget, that he had nothing in common with the mere tourist, or sight-seer. From the moment the project was announced, the heart of Catholic Ireland went out to it ; and the required number of pilgrims quickly sent in their names. But, as many more could hope to go only in spirit, there was formed a holy league of prayer, and a million of associates promised to pray, during the whole jubilee month, for the Pope, and for the objects of the Irish pilgrimage ; while the pilgrims, on their part, were not to forget their associates at the feet of the Holy Father and at the various shrines which they were to visit. Thus we had well-nigh a third of the total Catholic population of the entire nation leagued together in a holy union of prayer, and that for the country they loved, and for the Church to which that country had ever been so devotedly attached.

The departure of the pilgrimage, consisting of clergy and laity from every part of Ireland, having at their head an Irish Cardinal and several Irish Bishops, and carrying their beautiful banner of St. Patrick, was a scene which one could hardly contemplate without reverting, as if instinctively, to the sad and chequered history of our country. Whatever is glorious in our history is inseparably bound up with the Church—our devotion to it, and our sufferings for it ; and this splendid manifestation of faith and of loyalty goes to prove that, in spite of some recent indications, the Ireland of to-day is not likely, at the bidding of discredited politicians, to cast off forever the grand and holy traditions of its past.

There were two epochs in our history, of which in particular we were reminded more than once, during our journey. The period from the sixth to the tenth or twelfth century may be styled the glorious epoch of the Church in Ireland. The country became the "Insula sanctorum et doctorum"; scholars flocked to it from every land in Europe in search of wisdom. But it was not this only. The holy and learned men of this Western island went out to distant lands to preach and teach ; "peregrinari pro Christo" became their motto ; and everywhere along our route, in Belgium and

Germany, in Switzerland, Italy and France, high up in the Alps and on the slopes of the Apennines, we could find records and memorials without number of the pilgrim saints and zealous missionaries from Ireland, who had traversed the same countries, and followed the same route fully a thousand years ago. This is one of the most interesting and beautiful facts in connection with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland, or indeed of any other country; but it is as certain and undeniable as it may seem astounding. It is no dream of Irishmen; for strangers bear willing testimony to it, and in many instances, in the absence of old records at home, it is on their testimony that we rely chiefly, or entirely. We are informed that there were no less than "one hundred and fifty Irish saints honored as patrons of places in Germany, of whom thirty-six were martyrs; forty-five in Gaul, of whom six were martyrs; thirty in Belgium; forty-four in England; thirteen in Italy; and in Iceland and Norway, eight martyrs besides many others." [1]

They preached to, and converted barbarous tribes; they built monasteries, and, in many instances, became bishops, where we find them to-day honored as patrons. There was one goal, however, to which their hearts turned more lovingly than to all else, a centre which seemed to have had an irresistible attraction for them, and that was Rome. The number of our great Irish saints who found their way to Rome, in those early times, had often been a puzzle to me, and I confess I never found it so hard to solve, as when for the first time I undertook the journey myself; even in these days of fast and easy travel. But devotion to Rome was one of the lessons St. Patrick had taught; and it is a lesson that, in Ireland, never has been—and may it never be—forgotten. Moore, our national poet, has a beautiful fancy about the "sunflower turning towards its god, when he sets, the same look which it turned when he rose." Naturalists I believe do not support the poet; but if there were more of fact, and less of fancy in the thought, it would be a fitting emblem of the

1 Cogan's Meath, quoting White's *Apologia*.

unerring certainty with which the heart of Catholic Ireland ever turned in weal and woe to Rome. It would be easy to illustrate this here by various beautiful and pathetic stories; but I take only one or two examples which I find nearest to hand. St. Flannan, the son of King Theodoric, patron and first Bishop of Killaloe, went thither in pilgrimage early in the seventh century; and was consecrated by Pope John VI. About the same time we find that St. Cummian, who took a leading part in the Paschal Controversy, and who resided only a few miles from Roscrea in Tipperary, went to Rome and came back with various holy relics for his beautiful church at *Cisert-Cuimin*. One saying of his is worth quoting as showing the spirit of the man and of his age: "'An old authority' says Jerome 'rises up against me.' In the meantime I shout out: Whosoever is joined to the chair of St. Peter with him I shall be."[1]

In the Cathedral of Fiesole situate among the beautiful hills overlooking Florence, some of us were delighted to find the shrine of St. Donatus, who had been Bishop of Fiesole in the eighth century. He had gone, like so many of his countrymen, to visit the famous shrines and churches of other countries, and particularly those of Rome, the centre of unity. Having come to Fiesole, the people were just then without a bishop; and they were deliberating about the choice of a suitable person when, by a manifestly divine interposition, the pilgrim Saint from Scotia was selected.[2]

When the day of Ireland's martyrdom came, the union with Rome was rendered, if possible, closer than ever. The Niobe of the nations, there is nothing more certain than that all, or nearly all her sorrows were because of her devotion to the faith. Did she but abandon that, her history would have been a far different story. "I know not," wrote Lord Deputy Chichester, "how this attachment to the Catholic faith is so deeply rooted in the hearts of the Irish, unless it be that the very soil is infected, and the air tainted with Popery! for they obstinately prefer it to all things

1 Moran's Irish Saints.

2 See Miss Stokes "Six months in the Apennines."

else, to allegiance to their king, to respect for his ministers, to the care of their own posterity, and to all their hopes and prospects.'"[1]

Verily a noble eulogium, and from a source so far above suspicion! During all the dark days of her sufferings Ireland looked to Rome, and never in vain; the word of encouragement and wise counsel of the Mother of Churches was never wanting; and material aid was given as well as spiritual. When her chiefs had to become exiles they went to Rome; and the Irish pilgrims found in one of the churches which they visited there a flag stone before the high altar, which told, that beneath lay the bones of the exiled earl of Tyrconnell. On the way too, they saw the house in which O'Connell, on his journey to Rome, breathed his last; and in which he bequeathed "his soul to God, his body to Ireland, and his heart to Rome." This will show that the pilgrimage that left Dublin on the 7th of last February, if the first of modern pilgrimages, of the kind, was the first of modern ones only; and that in undertaking such a journey we were but following the precedent given by, and treading the footsteps of, the holiest and best of the children of St. Patrick, during the most glorious periods of our history.

Of Rome itself, with its countless objects to attract the Christian, the scholar and the sight-seer, I cannot, now at least, essay any description. The nine days of our sojourn allowed us but little to see of all that the Eternal City contains; but it was time enough, to make us understand the secret of the *attract* which that city of the soul can never cease to exercise. As long as the Vatican and St. Peter's stand, the Catholic will ever turn to it with veneration, as being the centre and seat of Catholic unity. While the Colosseum and the Catacombs remain, every Christian without distinction of sect, will linger with emotion, on the ground where the early martyrs for Christ suffered and died; while even the scholar will ever think it worthy of a visit as long as it contains the ruins of Pagan Rome—the *quondam* mis-

1 Episc. Succession in Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth.—*Moran.*

tress of the world. But I must not omit to speak briefly of our audience and of the Pope's Mass at St. Peter's.

No one who was present at the latter on Sunday, 19th February, 1893, is likely ever to forget the scene. For hours before the time fixed, the streets leading to the grand piazza di S. Pietro were crowded by long lines of carriages and all manner of vehicles; and when one remembered that all their occupants came for the one object, to see and be blessed by one venerable old man, a prisoner too in his own palace; that many of them had come from far distant lands, over seas and continents, and come to represent millions whom they had left behind; that many of them were men of influence and eminence in their respective countries; and when, in fine, one observed the hurry and rush on all sides, and the evident anxiety that all seemed to feel, you could not help feeling—I felt it as never before—that the Church of God on earth is a mighty and a mysterious power. In spite of all that the world can do, of its persecutions in the past and of its spoliation of the present—it is unquestionably the greatest power on earth, and a power the like of which has never been seen. Men have recently insisted that the question of the Pope and of his position is a purely Italian question, with which other nations have no right to interfere, but the sight of those seventy thousand men, speaking all languages, and coming from every land, should convince any one that he who said: "la cause du Pape ne connait pas de frontière" was right and wise. The scene within was still more impressive and suggestive of sublime thoughts regarding the unity and catholicity of Holy Church. It is the custom to receive the Pope with a shout of welcome, and I heard it stated by a Bishop, who had witnessed several similar demonstrations previously, that the enthusiasm on this occasion exceeded anything in his long experience of Rome. Indeed I doubt if ever the great dome of the world's greatest church, could have rung back so wild and so enthusiastic a shout of joy.

Two days after the papal Mass followed the audience with the Holy Father. An audience with the Pope must

needs be an event in one's life : for it means to stand before, and touch the hand of the spiritual ruler of more than two hundred millions of men, and to be blessed by the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. And in our case it meant, if possible, more, for it was to see a Pope who is destined to be illustrious even in the long line of the successors of St. Peter ; whose virtue and learning have shed lustre on his throne, and whose character and life have won praise from all men. The great Napoleon is reported to have said after a visit to Pius VII, then his prisoner : "I have encountered a greater man than myself. He rules over mind, I over matter. He keeps the soul and flings me the body." And when, a few years ago, another emperor visited another prisoner Pope, the abashed manner of the Kaiser as he stood before Leo XIII, indicated that he too felt that "he had encountered a greater man than himself." A first look makes it evident that Leo XIII is very feeble in body ; but it did not require the couple of hours during which we had the pleasure of seeing him closely, to satisfy one's self that his clear eye and close attention to everything that happened, indicated that his mind is as active as ever ; and that the world may expect other utterances from Leo XIII as profound and as learned as his Encyclicals on Christian Liberty and Labor. His manner toward us was not kind only, but fatherly in the extreme ; and the Irish pilgrims have reason to be convinced that in him we shall always find a friend in all our legitimate struggles and aspirations for freedom. True, indeed, he has warned us, and chided when occasion demanded ; but he would be less a father if he had failed to do so. He is intimately acquainted with our past record of devotion to the faith, and of sufferings in the cause ; and just because of that glorious record, he expects all the more from us, and is jealous lest anything should occur in the present, or in the future, that would be unworthy of such a past. It will please the friends of Ireland at home and abroad to hear that the Irish pilgrims made themselves conspicuous among the world's pilgrims for "order, piety and respectability." Morning after morning

they met in some of the principal churches, and after hearing Mass went in procession, reciting the Rosary and singing "God bless the Pope;" and it was easy to observe that the large crowds of respectful on-lookers were edified by the piety of the pilgrim children of St. Patrick.

In the coming time, pilgrimages to Rome, many think, will become of more frequent occurrence. The rapidity of travel is constantly increasing without rendering the journey less economical and safe; and the attractions of the Eternal City will remain. These pious excursions must do much good. They emphasize the unity of the Church and render it, if possible, still more close. They tend to educate pilgrims themselves in many things, and to edify those with whom they must needs come in contact. In fine they are sure to bring joy to the heart of our great prisoner Pontiff. He has been abandoned by kings and governments; let the people take the place of the rulers, for no Pope that ever reigned has greater claim on the loyal allegiance and loving sympathy of the sovereign people.

J. HALPIN, C.C.

Roscrea, Ireland.

CONFERENCES.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS REGARDING MIXED MARRIAGES.

The article on "Mixed Marriages" in the March number of the REVIEW has, as we anticipated, called forth not only expressions of opinion as to the advisability of sustaining the writer's plea, but also some facts not generally known regarding the publication of Banns in the United States. As to the former we publish a paper by a learned Redemptorist, Professor of Moral Theology at Ilchester, which may be considered as on the whole representative of such views as have been communicated to us on the subject, by competent critics.

Regarding the publication of Banns the following comment from the Rev. Dr. P. F. Dissey, Professor of Theology at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, to which he adds the authentic documents taken from the Archives of the Archdiocese, speaks for itself.

ED.

PUBLICATION OF BANNS IN MIXED MARRIAGES.

REVEREND AND DEAR FATHER:

In the article on Mixed Marriages (March, p. 174) the writer remarked that it is difficult to say why the prescription of the VI Prov. Council of Baltimore (that Banns should be published before mixed marriages) was never complied with. I may, I think, explain why neither the footnote, p. 244, nor the directions given about this point of discipline by the then Prefect of the S. C. of the Propag., Card. Fransoni, had any effect.

But let me first observe that the footnote is at fault when stating: "Ex responso S. Cong. quod. infra pag. 253, reperietur, Banna

etiam matrimoniorum mixtorum *sunt proclamanda*," for Card. Fransoni simply says that in mixed marriages the Banns *may be* published, and does not impose an absolute prescription; this observation is not mine, but that of Card. Franchi in the first of the two letters of which I am going to speak: " . . neque in ea (Epistola Card. Fransoni) legitur . . . . ut fiant proclamationes etiam quando agitur de matrimoniis mixtis, quae verba absolutum praeceptum continerent, sed duntaxat quod: 'cum cautelae loco et veluti prudentiale remedium haec bannorum publicatio haberi debeat, *nulla ratio satis firma obesse videtur* quominus proclamationes etiam quando agitur de matrimoniis mixtis fiant.'" But even this simply permissive rule of Card. Fransoni had no effect. Why? Arch. P. F. Kenrick, in a diocesan Synod held in Baltimore, in June 1857, offers us an explanation of this fact. In the 5th Constitution of this Synod we read the following enactment: " . . . Mixtis matrimoniis Banna non sunt permittenda juxta constantem Ecclesiae Romanae disciplinam: *quod enim in quadam S. Cong. responsione ad Concilii Baltimorensis VI decreta insinuatum est, errore scribae contigit*, prout certiores nos fecit, dum Romae versaremur anno 1854 Illmus Secretarius S. Congr. qui nunc Praefecti munere fungitur."

The Prefect of the Propaganda on whose testimony Archbishop Kenrick bases his statement is Card. Alex. Barnabo. This accounts for the statement in Archbishop Kenrick's Moral Theology: ". . . mixtorum matrimoniorum proclamationes in ecclesia faciendae non sunt, ne videantur probari." (Tract xxi, n. 127, in fin.)

So the matter stood till Sept. 24th, 1874, when Archbishop Bayley received from Card. Franchi, then Prefect of the Propaganda, the first of the two letters of which I send you a copy taken from the originals preserved in the diocesan Archives. This letter implies that Card. Franchi did not know that Card. Barnabo, his predecessor, considered the passage referring to the proclamation of mixed marriages, in Card. Fransoni's letter, as spurious and due to the blunder of an *amanuensis*. Archbishop Bayley must have informed him of it in his answer; hence Card. Franchi's subdued tone in his second letter, Jan. 30th, 1875.

Since the statements of Cardinal Franchi and Archbishop F. P. Kenrick conflict with those of Card. Barnabo, it remains doubtful if the permission contained in Card. Fransoni's letter, of proclaiming the Banns of mixed marriages, be authentic or spurious. This is the conclusion which Card. Franchi himself draws in his second

letter: "Quidquid autem," says he, "de his omnibus sit . . ." Anyhow if the genuine instructions of Card. Fransoni remain doubtful, those of Card. Franchi which are actually the rule in force on this point, are not doubtful, since he declares emphatically: "*Certum est Sanctam Sedem hisce postremis temporibus declarasse posse fieri proclamationes in mixtis nuptiis quae apostolica dispensatione contrahuntur*, quemadmodum patet ex iis quae Amplit. Tuae meis literis diei 23 Septembris superioris anni (1874) communicanda curavi. Quod igitur superest, oportet ut Amplitudo Tua, quando nova praefati libelli ('Excerpta ex Rituali Rom.') editio vulganda erit, curet ut illa juxta resolutiones praefatis meis literis relatas corrigatur."

The correction has been made, as every one may see in the recent edition of the "Excerpta," by a note p. 212, at the beginning of the article: "modus assistendi matrimoniis mixtis."

Excuse my long letter which may afford some light on the question of Banns in mixed marriages and precisely in the sense which you patronized.

Respectfully yours, etc.

P. F. Dissey, S.S.

LITTERAE S. C. DE PROP. FIDE ARCHIEPISCOPO BAYLEY.—24 SEPT. 1874.

"Innotuit huic S. Congr. in Libello cui titulus—*Excerpta ex Rituali Romano* etc., et cujus v^ta^ editio isthic anno 1886 prodiit art°. *Modus assistendi matrimoniis mixtis*, pag. 189, affixam fuisse notam ubi praescribitur proclamationes in iis nuptiis esse omittendas et quod in epistola S. Congr. anno 1847 ex occasione Decreti III Conc. Prov. Baltim. VI ad praedecessorem tuum data, hac super re legitur amanuensium incuria mendose irrepsisse, prout ejusdem S. Consilii Secretarius declaravit. Qui hanc notam apposuit eam hausisse videtur ex quodam opere *De Matrim.* hic Romae edito, pag. 201, ubi idipsum asseritur. Eadem autem nota prostat et in alio opusculo *Enchiridion Sacerdotum* etc. Romae 1870.

Sed illa assertio sive quod ad factum, sive quod ad doctrinam attinet, spectetur, est falsitatis arguenda. Enimvero quod ad factum, praefata Epistola tanquam undequaque authentica retineri debet, uti ex Tabularii regestis constat, nullaque fuit interpolatione unquam vitiata. Neque in ea legitur, quemadmodum nota supponit, "ut fiant proclamationes etiam quando agitur de matrimoniis mixtis" quae verba absolutum praeceptum continerent, sed duntaxat, quod "cum cautelae loco et veluti prudentiale remedium haec bannorum publicatio haberi debeat, *nulla ratio satis firma obesse videtur*, quominus proclamationes etiam quando agitur de matrimoniis mixtis fiant."

Si vero de doctrina sit sermo, quod in memoratis literis exprimitur, iterum, iterumque S. Sedes pronuntiavit, atque ut alias anteriores declarationes silentio praetéream, meminisse sat erit S. Congr. Supremae Inquisitionis sub Feria IV, die 11 Maii, 1864, Episcopo Natchetensi rescripisse "posse fieri proclamationes in mixtis nuptiis quae apostolica dispensatione contrahuntur, suppressa tamen mentione religionis contrahentium . . . ." Et hoc S. Consilium Christiano nomini propagando praepositum, dum mense Maio, an. 1871, ad examen revocavit Acta et Decreta Synodi Smyrnis habitae decrevit: "Proclamationes, quae in matrimoniis praemittuntur non fiant in mixtis connubiis nisi quando necessariae et opportunae videantur, judicio ordinarii, pro detegendis impedimentis et omissa mentione religionis eorum qui nuptias sunt contracturi."

Quae cum ita se habeant Amplitudinem Tuam rogo ut, quando nova praefati Ritualis seu libelli editio vulgabitur curet illum juxta hactenus exposita corrigendum. Interim Deum precor ut Te diu incolumem servet.

Ampl. Tuae

Uti Frater addictissimus,

ALEX. *Card.* FRANCHI, *Praef.*
JOANNES SIMEONI, *Secretarius.*

Romae ex Aedib. S. Congr. de P. Fide; die 24 Sept. 1874.

LITERAE S. C. DE P. FIDE ARCHIEPISCOPO BAYLEY.

30 JANUARY, 1875.

Ex literis Amplitudinis Tuae proxime elapso mense Decembri ad me datis intellexi ob quasnam rationes in libello cui titulus "*Excerpta ex Rituali Romano*" affixa fuerit Nota ubi praescribitur proclamationes in matrimoniis mixtis esse omittendas et quod in epistola S. Congr. an. 1847 occasione Decreti III Concilii Provincialis Baltimorensis VI ad praedecessorem tuum data, hac super re legitur, amanuensium incuria mendose irrepsisse.

Quidquid autem de his omnibus sit, certum est Sanctam Sedem hisce postremis temporibus declarasse *posse fieri proclamationes in mixtis nuptiis quae apostolica dispensatione contrahuntur*, quemadmodum patet ex iis quae Amplitudini Tuae meis literis diei 24 Septembris superioris anni communicanda curavi. Quod igitur superest, oportet ut Amplitudo Tua, quando nova praefati libelli editio vulganda erit, curet ut ille juxta resolutiones praefatis meis literis relatas corrigatur.

Interea Deum precor . . .

Amplit. Tuae

Uti frater addictissimus

ALEX. *Card.* FRANCHI, *Praef.*

IOANNES SIMEONI, *Secretarius.*

Romae ex Aedib. S. C. de Prop. Fide die 30 Ianuarii, 1875.

JURISDICTION REGARDING MARRIAGE CELEBRATION.

Qu. You will favor a subscriber by answering the following: Two parties are to be married. They belong to two different parishes (not included in the restrictions of the Council of Trent). Where and by whom should they be married?

What is the law; what is the custom in the United States?

Resp. "If the parties belong to different parishes, they may be married by the parish priest of either parish." (Smith, Elements of Eccl. Law, p. iii, c. ix, n. 658.) The

common ecclesiastical law leaves the choice of either of the two respective domiciles *to the parties who are to be married.* Custom gives the preference to the parish of the *sponsa* unless the parties themselves desire a different arrangement: and in some dioceses this is a statute-law according to which the apportionment of perquisites or *jura stola* is determined. "Ex jure communi nihil statuitur, cui (parocho) ex illis prae aliis competat matrimonio assistere, sed partim hoc relinquitur libero arbitrio contrahentium, partim statutis particularibus dioecesanis; in multis locis quoad *liceitatem* parochus *sponsae* proprius habetur." (Heiss, De Matrim. Tract. iii, §45, iv).

I.—THE OFFICE "AD LIBITUM" ON FRIDAYS IN LENT. II.—TRANSFER OF A "DIES FIXA."

Qu. Is the Monitum 3 of the Baltimore Ordo correct when it says that the Offices of the Passion on Fridays are *ad libitum* and that therefore on the 17th of March the Mass of St. Patrick can be read instead of the Mass of the Precious Blood; if so, how is it that the Pustet Ordo omitted to make mention of it? Also how have both Ordos made a mistake of transferring St. Joseph to the 22d instead of the 20th, and since it is evidently a mistake, must we follow the Calendar or can we say the Mass of St. Joseph on the 20th?

I trust you will oblige me with a personal answer as I need it for a particular purpose.

I.

Resp. In 1840 the Holy See granted to the clergy of the United States, among other special offices proposed by the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore, those of the Instruments of the Passion, which were to be recited on the Fridays during Lent *sub ritu dupl. maj. ad libitum.*

Shortly afterwards the question was raised, whether, if a fixed feast of higher rite occurred on any of these Fridays, the aforesaid Offices of the Passion could be transferred to the next vacant day. The Indult did not mention anything about this and the general rule regarding feasts *ad libitum* is that they can not be transferred, unless the terms of their conces-

sion say so. Accordingly the S. Congregation was asked whether these Friday Offices *ad libitum* could be transferred, and the answer was in the affirmative, provided the translation of these feasts of the Passion could take place within the Lenten season. The following is the decree:

QUÆSITUM.

Sanctitas Sua benigne concessit sequentia officia singulis Feriis sextis Quadragesimae *ad libitum* recitanda sub ritu duplicis majoris, nempe Commemorationis Passionis D. N. J. C. . . . et Pretiosissimi Sanguinis. *Si autem in dictis diebus occurrat festum altioris ritus, quaeritur an supra memorata Officia transferri possint* ad primam diem non impeditam intra Quadragesimam.

Resp. S. C. C. Die 22 Maii 1841.

Affirmative et intra Quadragesimam tantum.

(Ex. Conc. Prov. Baltimor. IV anno 1840.)

This year the feast of St. Patrick fell on Friday and the Ordo assigned the Office of the Most Precious Blood for that day, making simply a commemoration of St. Patrick in the Office and Mass.

Was this correct? and if so, on what ground does an Office *ad libitum* displace a double feast in such a way as to leave us no choice between reciting either one or the other?

The answer to this is:

That an office *ad libitum* becomes obligatory after it has been adopted into the diocesan Kalendar with the sanction of the Ordinary, and in such case ranks above any feast which may fall on the same day.

A Carpo (Compend. Biblioth. Liturg., Pars ii, c. xiii, n. 179), speaking of votive Offices *ad libitum* says: "Quamvis porro sunt ad libitum, Clerici tamen (sive saeculares sive regulares) qui ad horas canonicas obligantur, *tenentur recitare* Officia votiva ex indulto Apostolico concessa, *si jussu Ordinarii (vel superioris regularis) apponantur in Kalendario diebus non impeditis.*" He refers for confirmation of his statement to a decree of the S. R. C., 23 Maii, 1835, in Namurcen. ad 10. The "dies non impediti" are, according to Falise (Liturg. Pract. Compend. Pars ii, sect. iv, c. iii, 3):

1. Octave days (and days within an octave). 2. Holidays of obligation, although they be of lesser rite. 3. Sundays. 4, Saturdays on which the Sunday Office is to be anticipated.

For the rest, the sole rule which serves as a guide for the recital of the offices *ad libitum* is to be looked for in the terms of the concession and the evident intention of the source whence it emanates. "De officis ad libitum non est judicandum juxta Rubricarum mandata, de quibus lata non sunt, sed juxta mentem et leges concedentis, a quibus in suo esse unice pendent." (Cavalieri.)

The error, therefore, seems to be with the Baltimore Ordo.

Another difficulty here suggests itself. Suppose that a festum *duplex maius* occurred with one of these votive offices *ad libitum*, as might easily happen, for instance, in the case of the feast of St. Benedict (21 March), coming on a Friday. Both are of the same rite. Which of them has to yield?

The S. Congregation some years ago decided a similar case to the effect that the votive offices *ad libitum* would yield their place in the Kalendar only to feasts of higher rite. The *Dubium* which came from Spain read as follows:

"Huic dioecesi concessa sunt Officia Mysteriorum et Instrumentorum Passionis Domini per Decretum diei 1 Julii 1883, quo approbatum fuit novum Kalendarium dioecesanum, absque tamen indulto haec officia transferendi, quum in feriis quibus sunt affixa, alia officia potioris ritus occurrunt; quod idultum necessarium esse videtur, ex decreto diei 11 Septembris 1847. Ad foverdam igitur devotionem ergo Passionem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi hoc idultum humiliter supplicatur, et praeterea quaeritur: An transferri debeant non solum in occursu cum officiis duplicibus primae et secundae classis, sed etiam cum officiis duplicibus majoribus, dummodo sint primaria, licet minoris dignitalis?

Et. S. C. respondit:

Transferenda sunt in occursu tantum Festorum potioris ritus, sed infra Quadragesimam, juxta Decretum concessionis horum Officiorum pro clero Urbis.

Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit ac servari mandavit die 28 Maii 1886.

D. *Card.* BARTOLINIUS, *Praefectus.*
LAURENTIUS SALVATI, *Secretarius.*

FESTUM S. JOSEPHI IN OCCURSU CUM TRANSLATO IN "DIEM FIXAM."

The second question is whether the feast of St. Joseph, which occurred this year on Passion Sunday, was to be transferred to the 20th of March taking the place of St. Cyril, or whether it was to go to the 22nd of March as both the Baltimore and Pustet Ordos stated. The feast of St. Cyril properly occurs on the 18th of March but since that day was in the Kalendar of the United States previously occupied by St. Gabriel, the feast of St. Cyril was transferred to the 20th as the first vacant day, which became its permanent place or *dies fixa* in our Office. The doubt in the present case is whether a feast permanently transferred to a certain day must yield its place in precedence to a higher feast likewise transferred, as in this case the feast of St. Joseph.

The S. Congregation has on various occasions given different decisions applicable to special cases (such as Titulars, Patrons of Religious communities and territories), but the general legislation points to the conclusion that a transfer in *sedem fixam* only holds its place against feasts of equal or inferior rite, not of higher rank.

This conclusion rests apparently upon the distinction between a *festum translatum* and an *officium translatum*. The *sedes fixa* does not necessarily imply the transfer of the feast as in cases of holidays of obligation or solemn celebration on the Sunday following a feast. Feasts transferred in the Office, even permanently, from the *dies natalis* are subject to the general rules of transfer "si plura festa duplicia ex iis quae transferri possunt, transferenda sint, *quod est magis solemne* semper prius transferatur *et prius celebretur*."

From a number of decrees which lead us to this conclusion we give the following as presenting the various phases of the question, since we do not know of any decision which directly bears on the case in question.

FIXATIO.

1.—*Ad dubium*: An in fixatione attendenda sit anterioritas temporis et non superioritas ritus? S. C. resp.: In fixatione festorum

attendi debet, quod praecipit rubrica 16. Breviar. rom. sub. n. 7 *de transl. festor.*, ut scilicet prius agatur de dupl., postea de semid., et inter pluria duplicia, quod est magis solemne, prius semper celebretur, sive ex ritu sive ex dignitate majoritas ista solemnitatis proveniat; alioquin si sint omnino aequalia, umum ante aliud reponatur eo ordine quo erant celebranda in propriis diebus; *eadem etiam militat ratio in fixatione, quae probaret in translatione.* Die 7 Decbr. 1743 ad 3. *In Mediolan.*

2.—*Ad dubium*: In Rubricis particularibus Breviarii Franciscani pro Fratribus minoribus de Observantia, editi anno 1696, extat specialis Constitutio num. 15 dictarum Rubricarum his verbis expressa: Quando autem plura officia de praecepto eadem die in aliquibus locis ita fixe occurrunt, ut translatio alicujus seu aliquorum sit perpetua, tunc prima dies proxime non impedita assignata censeatur in perpetuum pro die propria Festi translati respective. An haec Rubrica possit in usum deduci ab aliis alterius Congregationis Regularibus, *ita ut censeri possit ab illis Festa perpetuo transferenda, fixa esse in perpetuum ad primam diem non impeditam*?

Et S. R. C. referente Emo. et Rmo. D. Card. S. Clementis respondit: "Negative."

Et ita decrevit et declaravit. n. 3749 ad 5, die 28 Augusti, 1706.

3.—*Translatio festorum* (*diversi ritus*). Si novum aliquod officium a S. Sede recitandum praescribatur aut permittatur die aliqua determinata, etsi dies illa sit perpetuo impedita in aliqua dioecesi vel Ecclesia propter aliquod festum translationis, cui dies illa assignata ibidem fuit tanquam dies seu sedes propria, utrumque autem officium, tam novum scilicet quam translatum, sit off. Ecclesiae universalis:

1. Utrum hoc novum officium sit recitandum ipsa die a S. Sede assignata, altero officio ulterius translato in illa Diocesi vel Ecclesia juxta responsum S. R. C. in Mechl. ad dub. 1. Et 2? Et quatenus affirmative:

2. An idem sit servandum sive novum illud off. sit dupl. aut altioris ritus sive semid. tantum, quum quodlibet festum sive dupl. sive semid. sit dies impedita pro officio translato?

S. C. resp. ad 1: In paritate ritus noviter concessum off. ulterius transferatur juxta rubricas.

Ad 2: Assignandum off. potioris ritus et inferioris ritus alterius transferendum juxta rubricas.

N. 4985 die 7 Decembris, 1844, ad dub. IV. qu. 1. 2. *In Mechlin.*

4.—Ex responsis S. R. C. die 12 Sept. 1840 in una Ordinis Excalceatorum ss. Trinitatis officium semiduplex incidens in Dominicam infra octavam privilegiatam reponi debet in diem immediate sequentem non impeditam quamvis officium duplex prius translatum reponendum habeatur. Unde quaeritur—An festum duplex per annum concurrens cum festo solemni dioecesis octava gaudente[1] transferri possit et debeat in proxime sequentem diem non impeditam, ita *ut duplex illud per annum celebrari debeat, ante festa jam alias translata, eo quod praedictum officium sedem habeat ut ajunt?*

Sacra Congregatio respondit: *Negative.*

Die 9 Maii, 1857.

From the above we conclude that both Ordos were at fault in assigning the Feast of St. Joseph to the 22d instead of the 20th of March.

SWEET WINES FOR THE ALTAR.

Quite a number of queries have been sent us within the last two years in reference to the safe use of wines for the altar. For the time we thought it sufficient answer to have referred to the different and especially the more recent decrees of the S. Congregation which bear on the subject; but after making inquiry from competent sources we are warned how well founded are the serious doubts of many priests regarding certain brands of wines (especially sweet wines) which are much in favor among the clergy.

The error which leads a wine-*dealer* to recommend his brands as pure fermented grape juice and therefore as the genuine material for sacramental use may arise from a misconception of what is demanded for the holy Sacrifice of our altars. It is well known that the ordinary wine-grower finds it convenient, and to an extent necessary, to add to certain brands of grape-wine so called conservative ingredients. These may indeed be the product of the vine, but they are not grape-juice and they lessen the integrity (though they

1. The Feast of St. Joseph would, as the Pontif. Rescript raising it to a *duplex I cl.* states, have an octave if it did not occur in Lent.

increase the consistency) of the pure juice of grape, which is the prescribed matter for the holy Sacrament, often to a degree which is not allowable. Such wines are nevertheless sold, and vouched for, as pure grape juice because there is little or nothing in them which can not in some way or other be traced to the grape in the shape of sugar, brandy, etc. We expect to treat of this subject more fully in an early number of the REVIEW. In the meantime we would suggest to those who have inquired of us that in purchasing wine for the altar there is but one way really safe, and that is to apply directly to a *wine-grower who is known to be a conscientious and practical Catholic.* We say wine-*grower*, because there are any number of good Catholic *agents* for wine-houses, whose sincerity is nevertheless no voucher for the genuineness of an article which *they themselves receive only on trust.* Happily there are quite a number of vineyards in this country, as well as in the French and other European wine districts, which are superintended by ecclesiastics who understand, of course, the necessity of having absolutely pure wine for the altar. There are likewise a number of prominent wine-growers in California and elsewhere, not only skilled in the culture of the grape but known to be conscientious and well educated Catholics who appreciate the importance of an unmixed altar-wine and the immense risk to which a priest is exposed by celebrating in any other.

BETWEEN THE MASS AND ABSOLUTION.

Qu. Kindly allow me space in the May number of the REVIEW or as early as possible to make a few comments on your answer to a question which appeared in the April issue about the lawfulness of having the choir sing an English hymn between the conclusion of a Requiem Mass and Absolution. You say: Should there be a notable delay after Mass, ere the Celebrant, who may vest in the sacristy, returns to the altar for the Absolution, the singing of a devotional hymn might not be a violation of the "liturgy."

I take exception to this ruling, and maintain that (1) there should be no "notable delay" between the Mass and the Absolution for the

dead ; and (2) that the Celebrant is not allowed under any circumstances to go to the sacristy after Mass, but should go directly from the predella to the bench at the Epistle side of the Altar, and there vest for the Absolution, the black cope having been previously brought from the sacristy and placed on the credence table near the bench for that purpose.

Now to the proof of my proposition.

We will begin with the Roman Ritual—The Rubric runs : "Finita missa, sacerdos deposita casula et manipulo, accipit pluviale nigri coloris ; et subdiaconus accipit crucem et accedit ad feretrum ; tum sequitur sacerdos cum diacono et sistet se contra crucem ad pedes defuncti, et absolute dicit sequentem Orationem : 'Non intres' etc."

Ex ritu Celebrandi missam, tit. xiii, n. 4. I quote the following : "Finita missa, si facienda est Absolutio, Celebrans *retrahit se ad cornu Epistolae, ubi exuitur casulo, et deposito manipulo, accipit pluviale nigrum*, et, facta prius altari reverentia, vadit cum ministris ad feretrum."—Wapelhorst, the celebrated American rubricist, on page 474 of his Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae, says : "Finita missa, Celebrans descendit ad cornu Epistolae, *ibique* deposita planeta et manipulo accipit pluviale, et procedit ad feretrum."—Martinucci, Lib. iv. C. ix, says : "Post missam fiet Absolutio super cadaver ordine sequenti. Postquam Celebrans ultimum evangelium recitaverit, Diaconus ascendit in suppedaneum et se addit Celebranti a dextris, et Celebrans, Diaconus ac Subdiaconus, facta simul ad crucem reverentia decendent a latere de altari et *directe procedent ad scamnum in latus Epistolae*, ubi Celebrans cum ministris ad scamnum devenerit, Ceremoniarius Celebranti detrahet planetam et manipulum eique imponet pluviale."

Falise is equally clear. He says : "Finita missa, Celebrans et ministri, debita altari reverentia facta, descendent in planum ad cornu Epistolae, et Celebrans insuper deponit casulam et induat pluviale nigrum."

De Herdt, Tom. iii, page 286, says : "Finita missa, Celebrans, diaconus et subdiaconus, post lectum evangelium S. Joannis, debita ante medium altaris facta reverentia, descendunt per gradus laterales in planum ad cornu Epistolae, *ubi* omnes deponunt manipulum, et celebrans etiam casulam, et celebrans accipit puviale nigrum."

Le Vavasseur, in his Ceremonial selon Le Rite Romain, page 527, says : "Lorsqu'on doit faire l'Absoute après la Messe solennelle des morts, le Celebrant, après le dernier évangile, vient au milieu de

l'autel, fait la révérence convenable et se rend a la banquette, où il quitte le manipule et la chasuble et reçoit une chape. Le Diacre lui donne ensuite sa barrette." You will excuse the number and length of the above quotations, but they are necessary as going to show that it is the unanimous teaching of the best interpreters of the Rubrics that, in the case under consideration, the celebrant of a Requiem Mass is not permitted to go and vest in the sacristy for the Absolution, but should do so at the bench whence he proceeds ad feretrum, when the choir begins to sing the *Libra*, thus precluding the singing of hymns whether in Latin or the vernacular, which are always out of place on such occasions, and should not be tolerated.

Resp. The reverend writer, who takes exception to our solution, maintains that (1) there should be no "notable delay between the Mass and the Absolution of the dead." We quite agree with him: *There should not be*. But, as we said, *should there be* (and who can always prevent it), then there is no reason why some devotional Latin antiphon may not be sung. Such was our expression, and there is hardly room for any exception to it, because delays are possible and, on occasions of funeral celebrations, quite common.

As to the second exception, we would suggest that it is equally futile, since the celebrant of the Mass is not always the celebrant of the Absolution. A prelate (Bishop) may perform the latter, and though he would be expected to assist in the sanctuary during the Mass he is not obliged to do so, in which case he would vest probably in the sacristy. The citations given above are all right if the celebrant of the Mass perform the Absolution as he ordinarily does, but in giving our answer in the case referred to we had to keep the several likely circumstances in mind.

We might, moreover, add that the authorities quoted would by no means endorse the apodictic ruling of our severe correspondent about what "should not be tolerated," even in regard to the special case which he had in mind. There is, a few pages beyond the passage cited above from De Herdt, a chapter—an entire chapter—about *what should be tolerated.* In that chapter, *De Consuetudine in Exequiis*, he will find enough to warrant the practice, whenever it serves

dead ; and (2) that the Celebrant is not allowed under any circumstances to go to the sacristy after Mass, but should go directly from the predella to the bench at the Epistle side of the Altar, and there vest for the Absolution, the black cope having been previously brought from the sacristy and placed on the credence table near the bench for that purpose.

Now to the proof of my proposition.

We will begin with the Roman Ritual—The Rubric runs : "Finita missa, sacerdos deposita casula et manipulo, accipit pluviale nigri coloris ; et subdiaconus accipit crucem et accedit ad feretrum ; tum sequitur sacerdos cum diacono et sistet se contra crucem ad pedes defuncti, et absolute dicit sequentem Orationem : 'Non intres' etc."

Ex ritu Celebrandi missam, tit. xiii, n. 4. I quote the following : "Finita missa, si facienda est Absolutio, Celebrans *retrahit se ad cornu Epistolae, ubi exuitur casulo, et deposito manipulo, accipit pluviale nigrum*, et, facta prius altari reverentia, vadit cum ministris ad feretrum."—Wapelhorst, the celebrated American rubricist, on page 474 of his Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae, says : "Finita missa, Celebrans descendit ad cornu Epistolae, *ibique* deposita planeta et manipulo accipit pluviale, et procedit ad feretrum."—Martinucci, Lib. iv. C. ix, says : "Post missam fiet Absolutio super cadaver ordine sequenti. Postquam Celebrans ultimum evangelium recitaverit, Diaconus ascendit in suppedaneum et se addit Celebranti a dextris, et Celebrans, Diaconus ac Subdiaconus, facta simul ad crucem reverentia decendent a latere de altari et *directe procedent ad scamnum in latus Epistolae*, ubi Celebrans cum ministris ad scamnum devenerit, Ceremoniarius Celebranti detrahet planetam et manipulum eique imponet pluviale."

Falise is equally clear. He says : "Finita missa, Celebrans et ministri, debita altari reverentia facta, descendent in planum ad cornu Epistolae, et Celebrans insuper deponit casulam et induat pluviale nigrum."

De Herdt, Tom. iii, page 286, says : "Finita missa, Celebrans, diaconus et subdiaconus, post lectum evangelium S. Joannis, debita ante medium altaris facta reverentia, descendunt per gradus laterales in planum ad cornu Epistolae, *ubi* omnes deponunt manipulum, et celebrans etiam casulam, et celebrans accipit puviale nigrum."

Le Vavasseur, in his Ceremonial selon Le Rite Romain, page 527, says : "Lorsqu'on doit faire l'Absoute après la Messe solennelle des morts, le Celebrant, après le dernier évangile, vient au milieu de

l'autel, fait la révérence convenable et se rend a la banquette, où il quitte le manipule et la chasuble et reçoit une chape. Le Diacre lui donne ensuite sa barrette." You will excuse the number and length of the above quotations, but they are necessary as going to show that it is the unanimous teaching of the best interpreters of the Rubrics that, in the case under consideration, the celebrant of a Requiem Mass is not permitted to go and vest in the sacristy for the Absolution, but should do so at the bench whence he proceeds ad feretrum, when the choir begins to sing the *Libra*, thus precluding the singing of hymns whether in Latin or the vernacular, which are always out of place on such occasions, and should not be tolerated.

Resp. The reverend writer, who takes exception to our solution, maintains that (1) there should be no "notable delay between the Mass and the Absolution of the dead." We quite agree with him: *There should not be*. But, as we said, *should there be* (and who can always prevent it), then there is no reason why some devotional Latin antiphon may not be sung. Such was our expression, and there is hardly room for any exception to it, because delays are possible and, on occasions of funeral celebrations, quite common.

As to the second exception, we would suggest that it is equally futile, since the celebrant of the Mass is not always the celebrant of the Absolution. A prelate (Bishop) may perform the latter, and though he would be expected to assist in the sanctuary during the Mass he is not obliged to do so, in which case he would vest probably in the sacristy. The citations given above are all right if the celebrant of the Mass perform the Absolution as he ordinarily does, but in giving our answer in the case referred to we had to keep the several likely circumstances in mind.

We might, moreover, add that the authorities quoted would by no means endorse the apodictic ruling of our severe correspondent about what "should not be tolerated," even in regard to the special case which he had in mind. There is, a few pages beyond the passage cited above from De Herdt, a chapter—an entire chapter—about *what should be tolerated*. In that chapter, *De Consuetudine in Exequiis*, he will find enough to warrant the practice, whenever it serves

the greater convenience of the celebrant of the Mass, of going to the sacristy in order to vest there for the Absolution. *Haec igitur*, says Cavalieri, referring to such cases in general, *erit regula* ut omnia quidem servanda sint quae et *prout servari solent*, *non autem rigorose*, prout jacent in rituali descripta.

ECCLESIASTICAL IMPOSTORS IN ROME AND ELSEWHERE.

For a considerable time past letters and notices have been privately circulated among ecclesiastics in the United States calling their attention to the existence in Rome of an *Agency for despatching ecclesiastical affairs.* Clerical "sore-heads," persons in quest of privileges, titles, relics, and the like would be given satisfaction in the shortest possible time, on payment of certain modest sums, which were specified for each particular category of requests. To a person of sense the proffered method must have of itself caused suspicion, but the agency seems to have duped a sufficient number of persons to make it worth its while to have continued the false pretence for several years despite the fact that attention was called to its bogus character on several occasions. Recently a notice has been published at the instance of the Roman authorities to warn Bishops in Italy and elsewhere of the fraud transacted under the title of the above-named agency which is located at No. 73 Viale Principessa Margherita and under the direction of a Mgr. Ferdinando De Deo, who styles himself Chaplain of the Sacred Palace.*

* We take the following from the *Osservatore Romano.*

DIFFIDA:

Dalla competente Autorita Ecclesiastica siamo incaricati di render noto a chiunque vi possa avere interesse, e specialmente ai Rmi Ordinari delle Diocesi d'Italia e dell'Estero, che una cosi detta "*Agenzia per disbrigo di affari Ecclesiastici in Roma*," esistente (secondo che indica certa circolare a stampa) sul Viale Principessa Margherita n. 73 istituita e diretta da un tal Ferdinando De Deo, che abusivamente prende il titolo di Cappellano de'sacri Palazzi, non gode nessuna ricognizione dalle Congregazioni Romane o altri uffici ecclesiastici di questa città.—Ogni giornale farà bene a ripetere sulle proprie colonne questa diffida.

The worst feature of these impostures is that they bring discredit on the Roman authorities and thus incidentally on the Catholic Church by being accepted as being genuine by those who are not familiar with the true state of affairs.

In some cases these schemes appear to be the result of positive malice against the Church and to receive their support from enemies of our holy faith.

We take occasion here to advert to another phase of this traffic carried on under false pretense of Catholic patronage and with the direct effect, if not intent, of injuring the Catholic cause.

It is well known that in Europe efforts are frequently made through non-Catholic agencies to obtain control of certain official positions and organs which affect the trend of Catholic opinion and the management of Catholic Church interests. Thus Masonic and Jewish trusts own and control "Catholic Newspapers," "Ecclesiastical publishing" houses, "Catholic" dispensaries, "Altar-Wine" and other "Clerical trade" concerns. These sometimes mislead Catholics into transactions whence arise those discreditable connections for which the entire Catholic community or in unreflecting minds "the Church" is made responsible. Our own country is not wholly free from such impostors in various shapes.

THE INDULGENCE OF THE SEVEN DOLOR BEADS.

In a recent number of the REVIEW we mentioned the fact that the condition of meditating on the mysteries of the Seven Dolors is not essential for the gaining of the Indulgences of the beads. To avoid misunderstanding we should have added however, that not all the indulgences hitherto attached to the meditated recitation of the "Seven Dolor Beads" may be obtained when for some reason the meditation is omitted. There are still three important indulgences (one of 150 years, one of 200 years and a Plenary) for the gaining of which meditation on the mysteries is a condition *sine qua non*. We are indebted to a Reverend member of the Servite Order for directing our attention to this exception.

SEDES CAMERALES.

Qu. Rev. Wapelhorst n. 9 ad 16 says "Non tolerandus est abusus adhibendi loco scamni sedes camerales." S. R. C. 17 Sept. 1822.

1. Are by this decree forbidden all kinds of chairs or a particular kind?

2. What must be understood by sedes *camerales?*

3. If it is allowed to use chairs, what form must they have in order to be in conformity with the rubrics?

By answering the above questions in the next issue of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW you will oblige very much, Yours in Xr.—

Resp. The decree referred to prohibits so called box-seats which, as the word *camerales* implies, are made with a covering overhead like a canopy, such as the ordinary Episcopal thrones. In former times wealthy and prominent lay-persons had such seats constructed for their exclusive use. This sometimes gave rise to odious distinctions and rivalries, an evil which the S. Congregation desires to prevent by forbidding their use.

Any kind of chair may be used to serve as a seat in the church, provided it be in keeping with the decorum of the holy place and does not give rise to the above-mentioned distinctions or similar disedifying abuses.

COMMEMORATION OF THE PATRON IN CHAPELS.

Qu. I have a Convent (mother-house) besides my congregation to attend to. Which patron, that of the Church or that of the Convent, must I commemorate in the Breviary; or are both to be commemorated.

Resp. According to the general Rubrics no commemoration of the Patron of private Chapels within a parish is to be made in the Office.

ANALECTA.

DUBIA DE MATERIA PARAMENTORUM, CONSERVATIONE OLEI INFIRMORUM, ETC.

(*Ex. S. Rit. Congregat.*)

IN LAUDEN.

Rms. Dom. Joannes Baptista Rota Episcopus Laudensis animadvertens in Pastorali Visitatione, quod in pluribus Dioeceseos sibi commissae ecclesiis sacra paramenta et suppellectilia adhibeantur haud liturgicis legibus conformia, quae quidem ob res angustas haud facile est passim renovari ; Sacrae R. Congregationi sequentia Dubia pro opportuna resolutione humillime subjicit, nimirum :

Dub. I.—Utrum adhiberi possint, sacra paramenta ex lana confecta, prohibendo tamen ne in posterum emantur ?

Dub. II.—Albae veteres ex gossypio acu pictae permitti possint donec consummentur ?

Dub. III.—In oratoriis ruralibus atque ecclesiis, quae parvum habent censum, planetae sericae flavi coloris, ut antea, adhiberi ne queant ?

Dub. IV.—In hac Dioecesi extant multa altaria portatilia, vulgo "pietre sacre," quorum operculum ex metallo confectum est. Quaeritur, utrum ejusmodi altaria consecrationem amiserint ?

Dub. V.—Thecae vetustae cum Reliquiis, quae authentico documento carent, olim ad suppressa Monasteria spectantes, possuntne exponi in altari, uti fit ab immemorabili tempore ?

Dub. VI.—Altaria Ecclesiarum olim ad Monasticos ordines pertinentium quae habentur passim consecrata, etsi carent sepulcro Reliquiarum (procul dubio sub tabulis marmoreis reconditarum, uti cognitum fuit in duabus ecclesiis, quarum altaria rursus consecrata sunt), debentne rursus consecrari ?

Dub. VII.—Causa sufficiens haberi potest ad permittendum Parochis Oleum Infirmorum apud se domi retinere, quia haec ab Ecclesia parochiali sejuncta est, ita ut hujus fores noctu per accitos famulos aperiendae essent ?

Dub. VIII.—Fasne est Parochis stolam induere super rochettum aut superpelliceum, sed mantelletta contectum, quoties Sacramenta administrant?

Dub. IX.—Canonici ecclesiae Cathedralis induti cappa magna et stola possuntne sacram synaxin distribuere, vel patenam deferre, seu porrigere quoties episcopus solemniter sanctissimam Eucharistiam fidelibus distribuit?

Et Sacra eadem Congr., ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, expositoque voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, re mature perpensa, ita propositis dubiis rescribendum censuit, videlicet:

Ad I.—*Negative*, Juxta Decr. in una Senen. diei 18 Dec. 1877 ad V.[1]

Ad II.—*Pro gratia, donec consummantur.*

Ad III.—*Negative* juxta Decr. in una Mutinen. diei 22 Sept. 1837 ad VIII.[2]

Ad. IV. et V.—Negative.

Ad. VI.—Datur potestas, vigore facultatum S. R. Congregationi a S. D. N. Leone Papa XIII, tributarum, consecrandi per breviorem formulam ea tantum altaria, quae certo constat numquam consecrata fuisse.

Ad. VII.—Standum Decreto in una *Toletana* diei 31 Aug. 1872 ad. V.[3]

1 An planetae ex lana confectae permittantur? S. R. C. resp.: "Usus Ecclesiarum laneas casulas non permittit." (Gard. n. 5715.)

2 An paramenta coloris flavi adhiberi possint pro quocumque colore nigro excepto? S. C. R. resp.: "Negative." (Gard. n. 4815.) Cfr. etiam Decr. in una Veronen. diei 16 Mart. 1883., ubi ad 4. Utrum liceat uti colore flavo vel caeruleo in sacrificio Missae et expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti? S. R. C. resp. "Negative." (Gard. n. 4707.)

3 Possunt Parochi retinere Sanctum Oleum Infirmorum in domo sua, eo quod extra Ecclesiam habitent, non obstantibus S. R. C. Decretis? S. R. C. resp.: "Negative et servetur Decretum diei 16 Dec. 1826 in Gandaven. ad III." (Gard. n. 5517.)

In citato Decr. habetur ad III Facti species: Sacerdotes curam animarum exercentes pro sua commoditate apud se in domibus suis retinent Sanctum Oleum Infirmorum. An, attenta consuetudine, hanc praxin licite retinere valeant? S. R. C. resp.: "Negative, et servetur Rituale Romanum, excepto tamen casu magnae distantiae ab Ecclesia; quo in casu omnino servetur etiam domi Rubrica quoad honestam et decentem tutamque custodiam." (Gard. n. 4623. cum adnotatione.)

Ad eadem Decreta remisit S. R. C. in una Compostellana de 15 Nov. 1890 in Responso ad idem dubium. (Act. S. Sed. XXIII. p. 636. et Ephem. lit. 1891 p. 222.)

Ad. VIII. et IX. Negative.—Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit, et indulsit. Die 23 Junii 1892.

✠Cai. *Card.* Aloisi Masella, S. R. C. *Præfectus.*
Vincentius Nussi, *Secretarius.*

EX S. CONGR. INDICIS.

Feria VI, die 10 Martii 1893.

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravae doctrinae, eorundemque proscriptioni, expurgationi ac permissioni in universa christiana Republica praepositorum et delegatorum, mandavit et mandat in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri quod sequitur Opus a Sacra Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis Congregatione damnatum atque proscriptum Decr. fer. IV, Die I Martii 1893.

C. Maggio.—*Pio IX accusato dai nemici di Rosmini.*—Piacenza, Tipografia F. Solari, di Gregorio Tononi, 1892, sub hoc etiam alio titulo: C. Maggio.—*Leone XIII si puo accordare con Pio IX nella causa Rosminiana?*—Alla venerata memoria di Antonio Stoppani. —Lecco, Tipografia del Commercio dei Fili Grassi, Via Cavour N. 15, 1893.

Itaque nemo cuiuscumque gradus et conditionis praedictum opus damnatum atque proscriptum, quocumque loco et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut editum legere vel retinere audeat, sed locorum Ordinariis, aut haereticae pravitatis Inquisitoribus illud tradere teneatur, sub poenis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII per me infrascriptum S. I. C. a Secretis relatis, Sanctitas Sua Decretum probavit, et promulgari praecepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Camillus Card. Mazzella, *Praef.*
Fr. Hyacinthus Frati, O. P. *a Secretis.*

Loco ✠ Sigilli.

Die 13 Martii 1892, ego infrascriptus Mag. Cursorum testor supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.

Vincentius Benaglia, *Mag. Curs.*

Datum Romae, die 10 Martii, 1883.

BOOK REVIEW.

ENCYCLOPAEDIE UND METHODOLOGIE DER THEOLOGIE. Von Dr. Heinrich Kihn, Prof. Theol. Univers. Wurzburg.—Freiburg im Br. B. Herder, 1892. St. Louis, Mo.

As early as 1841 the late Benjamin Herder, the Maecenas of Catholic theological writers in Germany, conceived the idea of creating a complete theological library in which the best elements of that queen of sciences should be represented. The project was not realized until after the adjournment of the late Vatican Council. It was Herder's purpose not so much to reproduce the classical works of Catholic theology, as rather to cast into new forms the solid material contained in the standard works of the old theologians; to subject their pronouncements to a scrupulous critique, and to add to them the results of later research and modern true science. As a result Germany possesses to-day a series of works in dogmatic, biblical, moral, pastoral, apologetic, ascetical, and liturgical science which has hardly a peer in point of practical thoroughness and scientific accuracy.

To the scholar these volumes are a reliable medium for the completion of his theological knowledge, and to the student they are safe guides as text-books. But in the perusal of them it becomes evident, in proportion as we advance into the field of any particular branch of theological study, that there is an inter-relation and a dependence, one on the other, between the different branches of the great science, the full comprehension of which not only facilitates the better intelligence of each part, but is almost essential in order that the student may realize the practical importance of the studies to which he gives his attention in detail.

There are students, who, as is well known, devote themselves with a certain exclusive energy to the study of dogma, because they have been convinced, that it is the groundwork of all practical theology; others take with the same partiality to the field of liturgy, because it is a most perfect outward expression of Catholic dogma. In both cases the principle claimed as underlying each of the two sciences

is correct, yet exclusive devotion to either would produce on the one hand the unpractical hairsplitter of theological opinions, on the other hand the so called "rubric-fiend" who in his anxiety to carry out the exact ceremonial of a baptism will cause delays which deprive a child on the point of death altogether of the salutary ablution.

A survey, therefore, of the entire field of theology, in which each particular science receives its just place, in the order of its importance and in its relative influence on the other sciences, must be of great value to the student. Owing to the extent and the multiform relations of the theological disciplines which touch, and interlace with every branch of the speculative and practical sciences, this survey is not a matter of limited divisions but becomes a study of its own, with a science which groups the parts, gives reasons for the grouping, and points out methods of acquiring each branch in its immediate coherence with kindred branches or kindred portions of different branches.

Such is the work before us. It is the science of the theological disciplines in their entirety, showing their forms, their relation, the means which aid in their mastery, and the methods by which they are assimilated into a synthetic whole, familiarizing the student with the complete organism, so as to teach him to distribute and broaden the efficiency of his faculties in their exercise. In this sense the author calls his work an encyclopædia; not as a collection of theological material which will prove useful to the desultory inquirer, but in a formal sense, which defines, orders and reasons upon the different disciplines of theology as members of one complete and perfect organism.

The erudition and research displayed in the work is far above the ordinary, for its composition naturally required not only a complete knowledge of theology in all its departments, but of the literature that bears on each part, and an altogether extraordinary sense of discrimination as to the value of each element of the vast material which the author must first have accumulated before it could be assorted. The subject matter hardly admits of a detailed analysis. It is itself all analysis and rule for synthetic arrangement after the parts have been understood. The theological student is placed before the grand mechanism of Catholic theology; is taught to consider the function of each separate group of wheels and levers; then the pieces are taken apart and marked in order that he might find their proper position again for the building up of the system after

all the parts have been placed before him, and when he has realized the purpose of the structure which he is to raise up. Thus it becomes evident of what value the book of Dr. Kihn is to the student of theology; and, considering the mechanical habits of study into which our youth have grown by traditional methods, and the vast importance of a more rational system of study when the foundations of right reasoning have once been laid in a sound system of philosophy, there are few works which deserve more attention from teacher and pupil in our Seminaries than the one before us. Unfortunately, English literature of this kind is wanting where it is most needed; however, it may be presumed that at least those who lead in theological study in our Seminaries do not lack the facility of perusing the writings of the great German scholars of the present day.

L'EXTASE DE MARIE, OU LE MAGNIFICAT PAR LE R. P. DEIDIER, MISS DU S. COEUR. PARIS: TEQUI: 1892.

Père Deidier is a favorite among ascetical writers in France. He knows how to catch the scents of Paradisial flowers and perfume with them the air in this valley of tears. In the present volume (of about a hundred pages) he explains, with a charming attractiveness of style, the sense of the "Magnificat." We learn to gauge the motives which place the thoughts and words of that matchless canticle in their connection, and are drawn into a grateful meditative mood by the chaste suggestiveness of the portrait which the author paints of the Virgin Mother of Christ. It is difficult, indeed, to draw an image of Mary, without detracting from even that limited beauty which our imagination allows us to fancy, under the influence of a love which longs for eternal charms to satisfy its legitimate cravings. The S. Scriptures trace for us, in a few words, an outline so fine and chaste, that in the very simplicity of expression we recognize, not only the inspired hand of the writer, but also the implied confession of an artistic mind like St. Luke's that mere human efforts to describe such beauty were beyond him. Those who have attempted to fill out, in a measure, the simple lines of the evangelist have never succeeded by any other means than that delicate shading obtained in the school of devotion, and which is a reflection of the "Virtue" which "overshadowed" Mary at Nazareth and first enriched human thought with the conception of an "Immaculate

Mother." The brush of père Deidier is steeped in devotion, deep and true. like the tones of the "Magnificat" itself. He styles this "idylle precieuse devant laquelle pâlissent celles de Théocrite" justly "une extase" for there is hardly any other expression that would convey the sublime devotion by which the Holy Ghost filled a human heart and exalted it to a height that touched the divine in unbroken contact.

MARY THE MOTHER OF CHRIST IN PROPHECY AND ITS FULFILMENT. Controversial Letters. By Richard F. Quigley, LL.B., Phil. D., Lit. D. Second edition, revised and enlarged. — Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati, 1892.

"This volume is intended for intelligent lay readers, Protestant and Catholic, who are not content that their intellectual relations with their religious creed should, in these days, be simply mediocre . . . . and who aspire to have such intellectual conceptions of their religion as befit self-respecting persons in duty bound at all times to be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in them."

Such is the author's plea for republishing in the main a series of controversial letters vindicating the Catholic teaching regarding the Blessed Mother of Christ, which had been wantonly attacked by the Anglican Bishop of Fredricton, New Brunswick, and supported by the Rev. John M. Davenport, former Vicar of the Bishop. We have already, in reviewing the first edition, shown the masterly manner in which Dr. Quigley lays threadbare the thin fibre of pretentious bombast which the two clergymen passed off as strong bands of reliable knowledge in their arguments against a doctrine, the meaning of which they did not seem to have grasped any more than they were accurate in their statement of facts in reference to the doctrine which they maligned. The book was applauded on all sides.

The Rev. J. M. Davenport found a temporary way out of the difficulty in which he was put before the public of his district by boldly (!) requesting Dr. Quigley to furnish an *official* copy in English of the Bull of Pius IX, in which the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" was set forth, since this would be a crucial test of the "facts." To this request the Vicar added the chivalrous challenge (which must have convinced the public of his assurance that he was in the right) that he would have it "printed and circulated throughout this city and province." Dr. Quigley responded

by obtaining the desired official translation, which he sent to the *Globe* newspaper, together with Rev. Davenport's previous challenge. The translation bore the sign-manual of the Archbishop of Tuam, under whose supervision Canon Bourke had been appointed to make the official English and Irish translations, which are contained in the polyglot edition (of 300 languages and dialects) presented to Pius IX and preserved in the Vatican library. The copy sent the *Globe* by Mr. Quigley was forwarded to Rev. Mr. Davenport, who in the meantime had accepted "a call" to Philadelphia. He replied by a lengthy letter to the *Globe*, which elicited the following editorial remarks: "Mr. Davenport offered, if furnished with an official translation of the papal bull in question, to have it printed at his own expense and circulated throughout the city and province. Mr. Quigley responded by sending the *Globe* a copy of an original translation which bore the sign-manual of a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, the Archbishop of Tuam. . . . The translation issued by the Archbishop of Tuam is an official translation. . . . The copy sent the *Globe* by Mr. Quigley was forwarded to Rev. Mr. Davenport. About 60,000 copies of it ought to be circulated, if Mr. Davenport intends to keep his first promise. At a rough estimate the enterprizing and energetic firm—Messrs. J. and A. McMillan—who do Mr. Davenport's printing, ought to print these in a cheap form at 3 cents a copy, say $1,800; postage, say $500; wrapping and directing, say $250; making roughly $2,500. As Mr. Davenport does not appear to contemplate anything of this kind, the matter had better drop. Further discussion of it might be injurious to public morality."

There is in this edition much more of similar new and spicy matter which does not detract from the thoroughly reverent tone in which the author treats his main subject in the body of the work.

THE MARRIAGE PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES. By Rev. S. B. Smith, DD., author of "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," etc., etc.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1893.

Before the Instruction *Causae Matrimoniales* was published by the Propaganda in 1884, matrimonial cases in this country were regarded for the most part as "cases of conscience," that is to say, they were decided *in foro conscientiae* by the confessor or the

Ordinary of the diocese, and settled in virtue of certain extraordinary faculties, without formal process. This was so far satisfactory as it was a necessity, considering the often absolute impossibility and the delays of convening an ecclesiastical court in a missionary country with a shifting population, where priests were scattered and absorbed in active work altogether unfavorable to those stable and studious conditions of life which allow the formalities of juridical procedure. But, of course, serious evil sometimes resulted from this patriarchial method of adjusting matrimonial rights and wrongs, so as to revive occasionally the question of validity, where ecclesiastical legislation subsequently proved adverse to a former decision by a local superior.

The growth of the Church, and the fact that its centralization in different parts of the country has given to its administrative element a more stable and consistent character than was possible under previous conditions, has also caused the general introduction of canonical methods in ecclesiastical affairs. The above-mentioned Instruction of the S. Congregation is one of the evidences of this development. According to its prescription, there has been in existence for some years an organized system, with specially appointed officers in each diocese, to judge cases relating to the marriage contract. This system is simply the old Canon Law of Catholic countries, modified to suit the conditions of the United States.

That the methods, by which a decision regarding the validity of a marriage contract is arrived at, are not always a very simple affair, but, on the contrary, often complicated and exacting in the requisition of proofs, must be evident when we consider the severe code established in moral theology regarding impediments and other precautionary means by which the sacred character of the matrimonial bond is guaranteed and preserved.

It was with a view of making clear the essential points which come into consideration, and the duties of the officials as well as others casually concerned in the settlement of such cases, that Dr. Smith has written this new volume of his very useful series of books on the subject of Canon Law for the United States.

In the first and second parts the author reviews the nature of the marriage bond and the relative rights of Church and State to take cognizance of certain conditions preventive of or arising from the matrimonial contract and its violation. The "impediments" which render such contracts null and void are separately consid-

ered. The third part explains the offices of those who are engaged in the judicial marriage-procedure. This includes not only the duties of the judge, moderator, defender and secretary, but likewise the position and rights of plaintiffs, defendants (that is the party who opposes the annullment), as well as the duties and privileges of advocates representing these parties. Here also we find clear definitions of what are considered canonical proofs, of their value as evidence, of the requisite qualifications and authority of witnesses, of the weight of various legal instruments and pertinent documents.

The last part of the volume gives, first a general, and then a detailed outline of the manner in which a trial of matrimonial causes (of nullity) is conducted.

The logical division and popular mode of exposition of the work place it in line with other volumes of the canonical library which we owe to the erudition and zeal of Dr. Smith.

ENCHIRIDION AD SACRARUM DISCIPLINARUM CULTURUS Accommodatum opera et studio Zephyrini Zitelli-Natali. Edit. IV auctior et emandatior cura A. J. Maas, S.J., Prof. in Coll. Woodstochiens.—Baltimorae: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

Zitelli's Enchiridion is a helpful reference book for the student of theology and writers on ecclesiastical subjects, particularly those which relate to Church-history. As an accurate digest of facts, it serves the purpose of verifying dates in reference to the lives and principal acts of the Sovereign Pontiffs, the holding of important Councils, general and particular, the leading characteristics of heresies and schisms. Further it contains the dates and names of the various editions of the Bible, of single and polyglot versions; the names and works of the notable ecclesiastical writers down to our own day; also the principal collections of Canon Law old and new. All this is matter which the student is often required to look up and for the collection of which in one handy volume he will gratefully acknowledge his debt to the author. Father Maas' edition of this work, beside being brought up to date, contains a "conspectus generalis" of the Catholic Church in the United States grouped under thirteen provincial heads and an Apostolic Delegate. The book recommends itself as a practical and useful instrument of study to the theologian.

A GENTLEMAN. By Maurice Francis Egan, LL.D.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1893.

A healthy contribution to literature which will aid in raising the moral and social tone of young men's society. This class of books should be distributed with a ready hand by priests on the mission, in city and town, for it will do the work of half their preaching in a shorter and perhaps more lasting fashion. We may justly look upon the propagation of such reading as a principal part of the pastoral work in our day. Father O'Neill's excellent article in the present number on "The Priest as Book-Censor" will make the lines of this duty, in certain respects, more clear.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PRIMARY HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. 1893.—New York, Cincinnati Chicago: Benziger Bros.

NEW MONTH OF ST. JOSEPH—St. Francis de Sales. From the French by a Sister of the Visitation.—Baltimore: Benziger Bros.

THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR PULPIT USE. Prepared by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.—Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

MARY THE MOTHER OF CHRIST in Prophecy and Fulfillment.—Controversial Letters. By Richard F. Quigley, LL.B. Phil. D. Lit. D. —Second edition revised and enlarged.—Fr. Pustet & Co.

THE MARRIAGE PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES. By Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D. author of Elements of Ecclesiastical law etc.—Benziger Bros.

ORGANUM COMITANS AD ORDINARIUM MISSAE. Continens: Asperges, Vidi Aquam, Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus, Agnus Dei, Missam pro Defunctis cum Resp. Libera necnon Responsoria ad Missam. Ex Editione typica Gradualis Romani collegit et numeris harmonicis ornavit Joseph Hanisch olim Organoedus Cathedr. Ratisbon. Editio II, 1893. Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati. Sumptib. Frid. Pustet & Co.